

The Nation

VOL. XX., No. 18.]
Registered as a Newspaper.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1917.

[PRICE 6D.
Postage: U.K. 3d.; Abroad 1d.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
EVENTS OF THE WEEK ...	605	Women and the Trade Union Future. By Elinor Burns ...	620
POLITICS AND AFFAIRS:—		"The One Way Out." By E. H. Clutterbuck ...	621
Wanted, A Policy ...	608	The Scandal of the Disabled. By H. Sanderson Furniss ...	621
The Folly of Industrial Con- scription ...	609	POETRY:—	
The Senate and the League ...	610	A Soldier's Testament. By Eques ...	621
The Attrition of Transport ...	612	THE WORLD OF BOOKS. By Penguin ...	622
WHAT THE SPEAKER'S CON- FERENCE MEANS. By the Right Hon. W. H. Dickin- son, M.P. ...	613	REVIEWS:—	
A LONDON DIARY. By A Wayfarer ...	615	Literary History (Second Notice) ...	624
LIFE AND LETTERS:—		The History of the Soul ...	626
The Empire-BUILDER ...	617	An Essay in Anti-Militarism ...	628
America's Arcady ...	618	Sincerity ...	630
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:—		A Jumble Sale ...	630
The Past of the Tchecho- Slovaks. By Professor T. G. Masaryk and Noel Buxton, M.P. ...	620	THE WEEK IN THE CITY. By Lucellum ...	632

[The Editor will be pleased to consider manuscripts if accom- panied by stamped and addressed envelopes. He accepts no responsibility, however, for manuscripts submitted to him.]

Events of the Week.

By way of answer to President Wilson's address to the Senate, the German Government has issued the most deplorable document in its record. It opens, tamely enough, with an expression of general agreement with Mr. Wilson's conception of a good settlement and with his plans for ensuring lasting peace. It then launches into a polemic, worded without a trace of ability or dignity, against the war-aims of the Entente, to which, of course, the maximum interpretation is given. It concludes with the announcement that, since the Entente has refused peace on any terms short of the ruin and dismemberment of Ger- many and her allies, Germany will retaliate by dropping all restrictions on the use of her own forces at sea. Tucked away in this odious and ill-drafted document, is an announcement which might have hastened peace immeasurably if it had been made a year ago. The intention not to demand the annexation of Belgium is expressed, for the first time, without ambiguity. This is the one gain of the Note, and it should not be lost sight of amid the indignation which its conclusion excites.

In the "Sussex" Note, which accepted certain restrictions on submarine war, the German Govern- ment had warned the United States that these con- cessions might be temporary, and were made in order to give America time either to break down our blockade or to bring about peace. The present Note now abandons all these restrictions. The battle has been "forced upon" the German Government "anew" by the Entente policy, and it will fight for its "existence with all its weapons." What is intended may be gathered from the warning given to American ships not

to enter the blockaded zones, and to American subjects not to trade with or sail to ports in these zones. Worse still is an intimation, which does not figure in the published text of the Note though our Foreign Office has replied to it, threatening attacks on our hospital ships in the Channel, Straits of Dover, and part of the North Sea, on the alleged ground (which is certainly false) that they are disguised transports.

The effect of this Note has been, of course, to stir an immense resentment in America, which can hardly fail to be followed by overt action. The whole press has practi- cally given the President a free hand, including even Mr. Hearst's usually hostile and pro-German papers and representatives of the more pacifist journalism of the Middle and Western States. Many regard war as inevitable; nearly all look to a breach of relations. "The German Ambassador," says the "World," a close ally of Mr. Wilson, "must receive his passports forthwith." Most American liners have postponed their sailings.

THE German Chancellor's reasons for adopting— obviously against his will—the new submarine campaign are (1) that only now has Germany secured an adequate number of submarines; (2) that the economic position of the Allies promises a victorious peace as the result of an extension of the blockade; (3) that Hindenburg suggests this to be the best means of injuring the Allies, and in the present state of their military situation he will accept all the consequences of an unrestricted U-boat war. The first suggests that Germany must secure success within a restricted space of time; the second and third that the idea of a "military" victory is abandoned; and the third, further, that the enemy's general situation is desperate. There is here real ground for encouragement as to the war-situation; as a political device nothing could be worse for Germany than this manœuvre, or better for the Allies.

In the Memorandum annexed to the Note, the exact limits of its campaign of murder and terrorism are indicated. "All sea traffic will be opposed by all means" within certain zones. These zones, in effect, cut off Britain, France, and Belgium from all commercial and military intercourse with the world, and blockade the Eastern Mediterranean, with the exception of a channel for traffic to Greece. America is permitted to send a passenger steamer to and from Falmouth on certain days and under given conditions. The insolence of this "permit" is not likely to be lost upon the United States. Similarly, Holland is allowed free access between Flushing and Southwold every week-day for passenger traffic. The memorandum makes it clear that the blockade is to be chiefly carried out by mines, and this puts strict limits to its efficacy. Even if the Germans have three hundred submarines available, they cannot lay an unlimited number of mines, and the constant necessity of traversing the new British minefield must impose a check on their freedom of action. But the peril is grave, and we must mobilize against it every force of counter- attack at our disposal. We agree with the "Manchester Guardian" that Lord Fisher should instantly be recalled

to the counsels of the Admiralty and placed in charge of its anti-submarine organization. This is a first necessity; and if the Government hesitates, it should feel the pressure of a national demand.

* * *

MEANWHILE, it is interesting now to see what a break the submarines have already made in the world's shipping. Up to the end of the year 1916, the Germans claim that 4,021,500 tons of Entente shipping had been sunk. This represents between 8 and 9 per cent. of the world's gross shipping tonnage. The addition of 537,000 tons of neutral shipping brings the percentage up to nearly 10 per cent. of the world's gross tonnage. Some part of this has, of course, been replaced; but the bulk of it is net loss, and it is a grave matter for commerce generally that transport should be reduced to such an extent. We alone have lost, according to the German report, 3,069,000 tons—about 15 per cent. of the total of British tonnage before the war. During December it is claimed that 415,500 tons of belligerent and neutral shipping were sunk. An analysis of the submarine campaign seems to show that the vast bulk of the damage is done by a comparatively small number of submarines. This would suggest a limitation of the area actually necessary to patrol carefully, and it is a subject worth inquiry. The gravity of the question can hardly be exaggerated, and it would be wiser if the Admiralty were less reticent about the campaign. By refusing to publish the lists of losses itself, it leaves the field clear for the possibly exaggerated claims of the enemy.

* * *

THROUGH neutral sources we learn of the new British mine field which is to cover the German North Sea coast and lighten the burdens of coast and transport defence. The mine zone leaves gaps at Danish and Dutch territorial waters, but such exits, if submarines or raiders can be confined to them, will be a great improvement upon the old open doors in the North Sea. The northern limit of the mine field is a line from mid-Jutland to the Yorkshire coast, and its southern limit is almost identical with the northern limit of the zone which the Germans forbid to hospital ships. Between the two zones the bulk of the North Sea is covered, and the danger area adds a little more to the gathering troubles of neutrals. Danish fishermen have their best grounds cut off by the British mine field; but with the German area added to it and the few remaining restrictions upon submarines removed, the lot of the neutral becomes almost intolerable.

* * *

THE most important and welcome part of Mr. Asquith's eloquent speech at Ladybank is his cordial reception of Mr. Wilson's Address to the Senate, and his practical identification of its aims and language with his own. Mr. Asquith saw no "substantial difference" between the two ideals, save that the President's was the wider one. He would "blot out the geographical limitation of Europe, and associate the United States and, indeed, all civilized peoples in the same peace-preserving fraternity." He declined to criticize the President's phrasing, insisted that we had never had the "faintest desire" for annihilating the German people and State, for the object of the Alliance was not destructive, but constructive. But their views of a "victorious peace" implied that the Allies must have "solid safeguards" against the revival of Germany's ambitions, with their attendant train of "carnage and cruelty."

RUSSIA seems to have reduced the Roumanian campaign to a temporary deadlock. The lines upon which the Allies are standing are strong, and they lay a considerable handicap on the enemy in the matter of communications. Several of the German divisions seem to have been withdrawn, and it may have been in the attempt to fill their place that the enemy was seen to be transferring troops from the Bukovina. The Russians, at any rate, seized the moment for a vigorous attack astride the Kimpulung-Jacobi road, in the extreme south of the Bukovina. They broke through the enemy line on a front of two miles and captured 1,125 prisoners, eleven machine-guns, and three mortars. The pivot of the enemy's position in Roumania is near the area of the Russian success, and there can be no doubt that this part of the line will not be further weakened. The detaining attack west of Riga, to which the Germans replied so vigorously, also fulfilled its purpose. The enemy is still pressing his counter-attack, and gradually regaining the ground lost in Dimitrieff's sudden and skilful assaults.

* * *

ON the Western front the trench raids continue to create a state of uncertainty as to where the Allied offensive will fall. Some of the raids, like that near Le Transloy, achieve almost as great a measure of success as attacks made with vastly greater forces. The German attack at the end of last week on the west bank of the Meuse was of another character. The assault was made by considerable forces after a violent bombardment, on a front between Avocourt and the east of Dead Man Hill. It was met by a skilful and heavy barrage, and only on Hill 304 was any progress made. The lost positions were recovered by the French on the following day. These attacks west of the Meuse are motivated by two reasons: one is the desire to weaken the concentration east of the Meuse, where a French offensive would start with considerable advantages, and the other is to weaken such an offensive should it be projected, and actually begun, by placing a force in a position to assail the flank of the advance. So far the attacks have achieved neither of these ends.

* * *

GENERAL SMUTS has retired from the command of the forces in German East Africa to attend the Imperial Conference. Lieutenant-General N. R. Hoskins, who succeeds him, was formerly the commander of the first of General Smuts's three divisions, and his services in that position won unstinted praise in the recent despatch. He assumes command under conditions vastly different from those which obtained when General Smuts took charge of the operations. Then the enemy was entrenched on British territory. Now he is being rapidly penned in to a restricted area in the central part of the colony. Small captures are being made daily as the British forces brush the enemy back from the lower Rufigi and its delta, while General Northey's force continues to strike up from the south-east. It is this force which has recently captured an enemy column consisting of 250 Askaris and their thirty-nine European officers. The enemy must soon be completely enveloped and forced to surrender.

* * *

THE Speaker's Conference on Electoral Reform has done its work well, and the gain of so large a charter, won by unanimous agreement, is immeasurable. To get by consent what is virtually manhood suffrage, a large instalment of proportional representation, redistribution with equal constituencies, and the reduction of the cost of elections, at the price of the survival of a remnant of dual (not plural) voting and the

graduate's vote, is an immense progressive advance. Nor have we any reason to be disappointed that the biggest advance of all, the adoption of woman suffrage, was recommended only by a majority (a large majority, it is said). The Conference was composed about equally of suffragists and former opponents, and the majority reflects the recent conversions. No suffragist likes the proposal to enfranchise women only at thirty or thirty-five on its merits. The latter age can hardly be seriously contemplated. It means the exclusion of great numbers of those best qualified to vote, for the younger generation is better educated than the older women. It will exclude most of the munition-workers, whose services have touched the hearts of politicians. It is, moreover, irrational in itself, for women mature earlier than men. For these very reasons, however, it is not a dangerous compromise, for it will not be permanent. It may be politic at the start to conciliate the fear of a majority of women in the electorate. The sex bar will be removed, and an electorate probably of six millions, and possibly of more, will be created to safeguard women's interests.

* * *

THE sweeping away of all our ancient complication of franchises was generally anticipated, and the adoption of a simple six-months' residential qualification was the only possible substitute. With biennial revisions of the register, the leakage through removal will be small. The real surprise of the Conference was the unanimous adoption of Proportional Representation in something more than an experimental form. It will apply only to towns of 190,000 inhabitants or over. But since boroughs may be grouped to form a sufficiently big unit, and contiguous urban areas included in them, it is probable that a good many constituencies will be created returning from three to five members. The limit of five is rather questionable, and will prevent the complete unification of Manchester and Glasgow, which are entitled to more than five members. In London we may hope for the creation of a few big boroughs, like the old Westminster and Southwark, each returning from three to five members. The same principle applied to the Universities will for the first time make possible the return of two or more Liberals, one for the Scottish Universities and one at least for the younger English and Welsh Universities, which, by the way, will be relatively under-represented.

* * *

THERE are many minor gains to be reckoned. The transferable vote will (by a majority resolution) be applied to all three-cornered contests, even in single-member constituencies—a much better plan than the second ballot. Redistribution in counties is to disentangle, as far as possible, industrial from agricultural areas. The concession of the dual vote for business premises is not, in fact, nearly so serious as it looks. It is confined to the case of a business man who resides outside the constituency in which his place of business is. In the larger towns, which are to be made into single constituencies, many of the suburban areas will necessarily be included, so that the dual voters will not be numerous. Nor can a man exercise both this dual qualification and a graduate vote. The democratic gain from the making of registration expenses and returning officer's fees a public charge, from the reduction of permissible candidates' expenses, and from the check to the activities of "outside" organizations will be very great. From all these reforms labor ought to profit considerably, and there will no longer be any excuse for Liberal associations who choose candidates for their wealth alone.

THE most doubtful feature, to our minds, of the woman suffrage recommendation is the adoption for women not of the Parliamentary, but of the Local Government Register. It was in some ways better than the old Parliamentary Register, but it will be much inferior to the new one. It will not include the lodger at all, nor the daughter living at home, though the wife is expressly provided for. Further, it offers some opportunities to the "faggot" voter, since it includes as a qualification the occupancy of any premises or land. In Scotland, where the local and Parliamentary registers are the same, these anomalies will not occur if (as we suppose) the Scottish local register will be automatically reformed along with the Parliamentary register. Is it too late to urge that, with an age limit of twenty-five or (if we must be moderate) thirty, the Parliamentary register should be the same for women as for men? It remains to be seen what action the Government will take. Delay will be fatal, for the delimiting of the redistributed constituencies will require time. For women the only possible procedure is to include them in the Bill from the start—leaving the House free to exclude them, if it chooses. They cannot, in view of the Speaker's repeated rulings, be added to the Bill by way of amendment.

* * *

"SPEAKING with knowledge and full responsibility," Mr. Walter Long has announced that none of the German colonies will ever revert to German rule. There is some evidence that a decision of this kind has been taken by the Allies. The Japanese Foreign Minister, Count Motono, in a speech reported in Saturday's "Times," said that it must not be inferred from the silence of the Allied Note on this subject that the colonies were to be returned to Germany, and added that assurances had been received on this subject by Japan from the other Allies. It is strange that this subject should have been decided before the meeting of the Imperial Conference, nor was it wise to omit this demand (if it has really been adopted) from the Note to America. On a subject of the first importance it will now be said that we have concealed our intentions, and have even won open approval from American opinion, on the ground that in this matter we had shown ourselves disinterested.

* * *

MR. LONG rests our decision on the wishes of the Colonies themselves. But who has spoken for the Colonies? Mr. Hughes no longer represents Australia. On some of these Colonial questions the Colonies are entitled to give a weighty opinion. But no self-governing Colony was concerned in the taking of the Cameroons and Togoland. We are not at all sure that South Africa, in spite of the fact that the Germans were bad and troublesome neighbors, really wants to bear the expense of administering South-West Africa, and the trouble of assimilating its large population of German settlers. To insist on claims of this kind is, first, to expose ourselves to the charge that we are now waging the war in order to add to our Empire; and, secondly, if Germany retains any bargaining power at the settlement, it diminishes our chance of securing our far more important aims in Europe. Does France want to destroy the German Colonial Empire if that should lessen her chance of obtaining all or part of Alsace-Lorraine? Mr. Long has, fortunately, not debarred us from offering to Germany equivalents for her present colonies; but what is the objection to her recovering East Africa?

Politics and Affairs.

WANTED, A POLICY.

It is not surprising that British citizens, seeing the disappearance of the familiar landmarks of administration, should ask: "What is the Government at all?" For a world has been opened up to them as strange as that to which Rip van Winkle awoke from his sleep on the Catskill Mountain. They are assured that the Cabinet persists. But, in fact, this body does not meet, and it is clear that it is not a Cabinet, but a Directorate. This body of five has now existed for some eight weeks. Within that period the Prime Minister and one of his associates have made prolonged excursions to three European capitals, including the most inaccessible of all; another member has been married; a fourth has been the chief figure at the Labor Conference; and a fifth has addressed public meetings in London and elsewhere. A Secretariat has been attached to this absentee assembly to record its proceedings and transmit them to the great departments whose heads, by the custom of centuries, have been associated with the Cabinet, as the centre and clearing-house of their work. What proceedings have they recorded, and what has there been to transmit? The results of the absence of such inter-communication have been evident enough. The theory of the collective responsibility of the Ministry to Parliament, and of the presentment of a common policy, expounded and enforced by the Prime Minister, has disappeared. In its place each compartment of the Government has been segregated and has become a law unto itself. It is in the interpretation of this code of anarchy that the trouble has occurred. Take the question of our food supplies. The Food Director has naturally regarded it as a problem of distribution, and therefore of moderate prices. The Superintendent of Agriculture has looked at it as a problem of supply for a "beleagured city" which required prompt revictualling, and therefore a stimulus to home production. The conflict brought in a third party, the War Office, which intervened in this triangular duel with a demand for the men whom Mr. Prothero had earmarked for the relief of the hard-pressed garrison, coupled with an offer of a worthless substitute. The belligerents have been allowed to settle their quarrel in a joint manifesto, which sufficiently attests the victory of the soldiers and fixes the land in its present impoverishment and rapid decline. The license of speech which our new directors permit themselves rivals their eccentricity in action. One Minister declares himself a Protectionist, invents a great German importation of steel, and pledges himself to arrest it when the war is over. Another fixes an impossible figure for the War Loan, and threatens the country with what will happen to it if it fails to reach the goal. Clearly there is no "collective responsibility" here; the Ministry lives under the easy rule of "Say what you like" and "Go as you please."

But behind these and other encounters lies a question which cuts deeper still into the core of the national need. It dates from the Asquith Cabinet. Within that body a party, of which Mr. Runciman was necessarily the representative had long appealed for power to make good the breaches which submarine warfare has effected in our mercantile marine, and therefore in our power to sustain the war and the land campaigns of the Allies. That party was defeated. The All-into-the-Army section triumphed. The Board of Trade was never able to obtain the control of labor for an adequate shipbuilding pro-

gramme, for it was snatched from it by the War Office, the Admiralty, and the Ministry of Munitions. The full consequences of that policy are being reaped to-day; but we have as yet no assurance that the Government realizes them, or indeed that an adequate machinery exists for the consideration and enforcement of any policy at all. At the critical period of the war, when success or failure hangs in the balance, the country does not know whether the central source of its strength has been impaired, or whether the power of full or at least adequate reparation remains to it. It will naturally prefer to think that the Prime Minister's quick brain has realized his mistake in time.

These are questions of management, and Parliament, the rejected and despised of our present governors, but nevertheless the vital and sovereign power in the Constitution, is alone competent to resolve them. But the duty of interrogation goes beyond even these vital points of material. War and peace are not two problems, but one; and the statesman who lets go of one loses control of the other. As it happens, the political outlook has changed in our favor in the hour in which, in the eyes of the amateur, the war seems fixed in a kind of deadlock. We have had the American offer of a guarantee of the peace. And we have had the German declaration of war on the civilized world, a declaration of a Power so much in straits for its life as to reck nothing of its honor. In effect, the German Note is a veto on the liberty of seafaring, which, with some restrictions, the British Navy has steadily maintained. It orders the blockade of every seapath to Europe, and threatens death to every passenger or seaman, belligerent or neutral, who dares to traverse it. It thus calls on Mr. Wilson either to bow to the Prussian cap thus raised at the mast-head of its pirate fleets and restrict 80 millions of Americans to their home-waters, or to risk their murder, and then to avenge it. The decision is his; we have confidence in its wisdom. But the German Note seems automatically, and even designedly, to bring into force his pledge to regard the renewal of "sinking-at-sight" as a breach of friendly relations. That is war at one remove, and its sequel is a war of prevention and restraint against a Power that thus runs amok through the world's thoroughfares. The new development would not be quite so dramatic as it looks. When the first American intervention took place, it was in truth a new shield advanced across the battlefield. Unless we assume that Mr. Wilson will fail to carry America, we must treat his intervention as a veto on German aggression, and a substantial assurance that between the arms of the Entente and the policy (and possibly the arms) of America, Europe will be restored to freedom and democracy. What remains? Let us admit an ensuing problem of readjustment of great complexity. Is it insoluble? No, if the Powers can meet in a human mood. Is it then soluble by force alone, pursued to its final power of exhaustion? Again, no, unless we contemplate a desolation repugnant to the civilized habit. Then by a common effort of civilization? Yes, but the condition is that statesmanship re-asserts its moral power, its ceded territory, and reclaims for mankind their disappearing right to life and happiness. Germany's Note throws away her last chance of success in this war. The problem of settlement will be all the easier for that fact, if only the spirit of statesmanship presides over it.

We shall therefore hope to obtain a declaration of policy from the Prime Minister, and to find that it is an offer of an agreement with America, in harmony with the spirit of Mr. Asquith's declaration at Ladybank. We

say agreement, but we mean more than agreement. An Anglo-American alliance of temper and policy can now arise on a foundation of generosity and imagination, joined in the work of rebuilding the shattered society of nations. This is no "entanglement" for either Power. It is the reply to the call of a perishing world. The real business of the war is a settlement along which American ideas may march with our own, and conquer, by pacific penetration, the militarized society they discredit. Mr. George's natural sympathies must be with such an end. But America's tender is a Sibylline offer; time wastes it; passion and the approaching chaos of society may utterly consume it. Never since the war began has democratic statesmanship had such a chance of salvation for itself and for the spiritualities and temporalities for which it stands. Will Mr. George be wise and strong enough to seize it?

THE FOLLY OF INDUSTRIAL CONSCRIPTION.

It is impossible to doubt that industrial conscription is now immediately confronting the people of this country. When Mr. Lloyd George promised the labor men who consented to enter his Government that he would try the voluntary methods of enlistment first, the pretence can hardly have deceived them. They had the Derby military precedent before their eyes. They must have been aware that, by pretending to believe that Universal National Service could be worked on a voluntary basis, they were selling their fellow workers into bondage. Whether Mr. Neville Chamberlain was equally aware that industrial compulsion was inevitable when he hastily accepted the perilous and thankless task on which he is engaged, we need not conjecture. But these weeks of preparation and reflection must make it certain to him now. For consider the nature of the voluntary appeal addressed to men between the ages of eighteen and sixty. They are to be invited to state what other work of national importance they are able and willing to undertake, in case they can be set free from their present employment. But they are not to be guaranteed the work of their selection. They are, we understand, to sign a declaration placing their services absolutely at the disposal of the Director of National Service. Now, there can be no question that the need of more competent labor for services of national importance is very grave, and that, as more men are taken continually from industry into the Army, it will be continually graver. Indeed, we gather that the planning of this labor recruitment hinges mainly, if not entirely, on the needs of the military authorities. They are to inform the Director-General of the number of recruits required each month, and he is to supply them from industry, finding substitutes for those taken from essential industries by depleting the ranks of non-essential industries. But in addition to the Army requirements, great numbers of men are wanted for agriculture, shipbuilding, mining, and other industries upon which the crisis makes urgent demands. The immediate readjustments required to supply these demands would evidently involve the displacement and replacement of a good many hundred thousand men. Moreover, the process cannot be accomplished by a single stroke. It must be continuous throughout the course of the war.

Now, can any sane person believe that voluntary patriotism will induce hundreds of thousands of fully employed men to consent to quit the work which is their present livelihood, and which alone they understand, in order to enter another unknown employment for which they have no training? There is no analogy

with the wholesale voluntary enlistment which took place in the first year of war. The fervor of patriotism, which led myriads of gallant men to throw up everything and risk their lives for their country, is not available for this less heroic and less convincing appeal. Granting that there are entire large trades engaged in making goods which are not essential to national existence, it is unreasonable to expect that the men brought up to skilled and useful work in these trades will make, or recognize the call to make, "the great renunciation." A few thousand restless or speculative men among the lower skilled and lower paid employments may answer the appeal. But it will have no effect upon the ordinary working man working his hardest and doing his best in the familiar trade by which he earns his daily bread and supports his family. Among the leisured classes above military age, some voluntary recruits will doubtless be found, though few will care to place their services unconditionally at the discretion of a Government like this. The number of male volunteers responding to the call will be a small fraction of the numbers needed.

For some quite unintelligible reason women are not to be included at the outset in this general appeal. Yet it is evident, in the first place, that a far larger number of able-bodied women are obtainable by voluntary appeal. This was made manifest when last year upwards of two millions actually applied for employment through the Labor Exchanges. Secondly, women in large numbers will be wanted to fill the industrial gaps made by removing men. The postponement of the call on women will, therefore, have the effect, and, we must presume, the purpose, of emphasizing the failure of the voluntary method of dealing with the problem. Thus "forced labor" becomes inevitable, and the "pledges" given when the Military Service Act was passed and afterwards, having served their purpose, go to their pre-determined place—the political dust-bin.

But when compulsion is shortly introduced, will it do what is required? Will it add to agriculture the half-million workers needed to plough up pasture land and parks and to furnish the increased food supplies we shall be wanting this early summer? Will it furnish to our shipyards the skilled, efficient workers needed to turn out an additional tonnage of two millions this year? Will it replace the experienced miners still being "combed out" from our coal pits? It is ridiculous to suggest that any moving of human pawns on our economic chess-board will compass any of these objects. What is it proposed to do? To schedule trades according to the degree of their necessity or national importance. To enter the recesses of each trade and each business, and to classify the work which is done there by some hasty, arbitrary standard of utility. The printing trade is cited as an instance. We are told that work done for Government will have "priority," and that large quantities of ordinary private work will have to stop because the compositors will be taken out for other sorts of necessary work. What work? Ploughing up Mr. Leslie Scott's half-million acres, driving rivets into boilers, hewing coal, or doing stevedores' work in the docks? Such suggestions seem absurd, but they merely exhibit the inherent absurdity of the proposal to increase the effective productive power of a nation like ours, with its highly specialized industries, by a sudden displacement of the competitive system for a lop-sided State Socialism.

The root-fallacy of the whole proceeding is the notion that labor is a fluid homogeneous stuff, to be poured from superfluous into necessary industries, without any economic or human waste. Whereas the contrary is the

truth. The great mass of labor is narrowly limited in its acquired capacity. You cannot move it even to a kindred process in the same trade without great waste. Apply it to a hitherto untried process upon unfamiliar material in an unknown environment, it is for a long time to come practically worthless. Take an ordinary town laborer and put him on the soil. With the best will in the world, it will take many months to make him worth his keep. As for your displaced printer, what essential industry can you put him to, where he will not start and long remain an inferior unskilled hand, gradually losing the single sort of skilled and valuable power he had acquired by years of practice? Yet, in order to "mobilize the labor resources of the country," it is proposed to try some such experiment upon some millions of workers scattered over the industries of the country. If we understand the scheme aright, towns like Nottingham, Birmingham, and Reading, engaged hitherto largely in producing un-necessaries such as lace, jewellery, cakes, and flower seeds, will be ravaged wholesale, their unnecessary labor being drafted in gangs to feed the requirements of new munition towns, or dispersed among the dockyards, farms, and railroads, so as to liberate men of military age, or men better suited than they for skilled work in some other indispensable employment. This elaborate sorting, to be done, we gather, by Labor (now Employment) Bureaux, with the aid of local trade committees, in areas officered by Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners, will be further complicated by the sex problem. For it cannot be pretended that women will long be left out of the industrial conscription scheme. Why should they? Large bodies of female labor are available. Married women without young children (why not herd the babies into national *crèches*?) and the whole hitherto untouched employment of domestic services could be made to yield a couple of million units of the fluid labor-power in which the Government is dealing. This, too, can be poured out of the homes and the "relatively unessential" trades where it has been employed, into munition factories or other places whence the males have been extracted.

There are, of course, some other little difficulties to be overcome. The official sifters will have the task of deciding in perhaps several million separate cases what capacity a man possesses who has never tried his hand upon any other task than that now adjudged unessential, not for doing something quite different, but for acquiring the ability to do it. In other words, the subtlest and most important work which the educational system of an ideal State might possibly perform upon the children entrusted to its care during the plastic period of their life, must suddenly be carried out by a set of haphazard, untrained officials in the twinkling of an eye! Think of the waste, the folly, and the cruelty attending a process ten times—a hundred times—as difficult as the sifting performed by the military tribunals! The mere exposure of the waste and extravagance of this "conservation of national resources" ought to condemn it without trial.

This work of conscript labor would be worth little enough if the process were received with acquiescence. But it will not. If it cannot be resisted, it will be bitterly resented. Men will not willingly quit the work they know and can do to undertake work imposed upon them, which they do not know and cannot do. It will not, in fact, be possible to persuade them that their country needs what they must recognize to be a degradation of their efficiency. Now, conscript soldiers may be capable of being converted into effective fighting material. But workers forcibly put to work they do not wish to do, will do little, and do it badly, and, what is more, no supervision or detailed coercion

can make them work hard and well. Yet they are to be paid the standard rate of wages current in the trade to which they are put. In addition, where they are removed from the locality where they worked before, a separation allowance of 17s. 6d. per week is to be added to their pay. Now, nearly all work that is really of national importance is work demanding skill, experience, and goodwill. None of these qualifications is consistent with forced labor. Where, then, is the national economy of the scheme? The average work done under such conditions will be small in quantity and poor in quality. And yet it is to be paid as high as if it were normal skilled work, with the additional allowance. This in a country which is straining every nerve to finance the ever-growing cost of the biggest war on record!

One final word on an aspect of the problem we have not seen canvassed. Hitherto, under the Military Service Act, hosts of little businesses have been destroyed. Industrial conscription would destroy large businesses and whole industries by the simple method of removing the labor from the capital with which it worked. Conscript capital as well as labor is a cry already current in some quarters. But no honest or just man, however revolutionary in his views, would advocate a policy which would select for confiscation the capital or profits of unessential traders only, in order to endow more richly the profiteering powers of essential industries, most of which will still remain in private hands, subject only to an excess profit tax which they have largely learned to dodge. For the scheme that is put forward would, by suspending without compensation the entire profit-earning power of capital in the condemned trades, drive most of them to ruin. This confiscation of the capital and the skill of the employers and employed in a number of industries hitherto engaged in supplying the innocent if not necessary demands of the consuming public, would be rightly resented as an iniquitous selection of certain men and certain forms of property for war sacrifices which ought to be borne equally by all the nation. We are convinced that no net addition to the economic strength of the nation can be got this way. On the contrary, if persisted in, the proposal will do more to sap the patriotic spirit of the people than any other course that could be adopted. We admit that a certain not inconsiderable quantity of man-power is not at present employed to the best national advantage. But, as we contend, the best remedy is, not to bring compulsion to bear upon the individual man so employed, but to remove, either by taxation or by forced loans, the surplus income expended upon luxuries. This would, by the normal decline of demand, set free numbers of men and women from the luxury trades, who would then be available for voluntary employment in the essential trades. The labor thus got might not be so large in mere numbers as that which industrial conscription could be made to yield, but it would be willing labor, entering work which was chosen by the worker and not imposed upon him by the State.

THE SENATE AND THE LEAGUE.

PRESIDENT WILSON has before him a task which demands all his statesmanship if he is to induce the European Powers to join America in creating a League of Nations. The minds of politicians in the Old World are not yet busy with the details of the scheme, and until they have begun to examine the obligations which it entails, and the limitations which it imposes on the self-will of the sovereign State, we cannot measure the difficulties

which will have to be overcome. The other half of Mr. Wilson's task may prove to be the more formidable. He has to complete the education of American opinion, which is not yet by any means unanimous in accepting the bolder implications of the plan. Up to a point, there is clearly no division of opinion in America which need be considered. Nearly everyone wishes well to Mr. Wilson's effort to hasten the coming of a negotiated peace in Europe. Nearly everyone wishes to see America taking the lead in an effort to create a League of Nations for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Nearly everyone wants to see the signature of a general pact, binding Governments to submit all obstinate differences to some process of impartial settlement, whether by conciliation or arbitration. In promoting that treaty, in creating the Standing Council of Conciliation, in developing the permanent Court, and in elaborating the whole conception of a moratorium by which the outbreak of hostilities may be delayed, the American people seems to be wholly at one. Acute differences begin only when it is proposed to pass beyond this voluntary moral agreement, and to bind the signatory Powers to use force, if force is needed, to repress a Power who threatens to break this pact by resorting to war, without awaiting the prescribed procedure of conciliation or arbitration.

At this point three schools of thought emerge. Mr. Wilson himself, the "League to Enforce Peace," of which ex-President Taft is the chief figure, and with them a very powerful combination of leading men in letters, politics, and affairs, are prepared to shoulder this responsibility without reserves, to step finally out of their traditional isolation, and place the whole potential force of the States, military, naval, and economic, at the service of the world's peace, when aggression is threatened, or a treaty broken. The Democratic Party adopted this programme at the past election, and the Republican Party, though its own formula was more cautious, did not challenge it. The extremer pacifist wing, led by Mr. Bryan, is now, however, entering an objection of principle against any undertaking to use force. They wish that America shall herself adopt the rule of peaceful settlements and use her moral influence to inculcate it on others. Further than that they will not go. They desire to be neutral, not merely in this war, but even in a war which might break out through the deliberate breach of an accepted pledge to follow an agreed procedure. There is no doubt that this section is strong in the Middle-West, and has behind it a powerful moral sentiment. A third school may in the end prove more influential. Its position is in line with tradition. It is conservative, nationalist, and would claim to be cautious and prudent. It has no theoretical objection to the use of force. It by no means says in advance that it would always object to the use of force in the service of a League. But it shrinks from giving a pledge in advance to use force. It will judge what should be done when the emergency arises, and presumably it will be guided in its decision primarily by its view of what American interests dictate.

This is the view of Senators Root and Lodge, and it is likely to have great weight in the always conservative Senate. The Senate is traditionally jealous in preserving its own powers, and it sees in a treaty which must automatically prescribe America's action in grave emergencies, a threat to its own autonomy. When it says that America should be free to decide these sovereign issues as they arise, it means in fact that the Senate should retain this power. The position is a very natural

one, and it has a specious appearance of prudence. It is substantially the traditional policy of British diplomacy. We were always inclined to play the part of a make-weight in the European balance. We thought we could best conserve peace by going into a struggle or standing outside it, as our inclinations and calculations moved us. We shrank from alliances which entailed an absolute obligation, and evolved instead the rather equivocal tie of the "entente." This third American school seems to have developed a somewhat similar position. It has got beyond the stage of "splendid isolation" and "no intervention." It is not prepared for the close bonds of a permanent obligation. What is the exact balance of these three schools in the Senate, no one can certainly say, but unless Mr. Wilson can overcome his Pacifists and the Conservatives, the immediate prospect of any League of Nations is gravely compromised. Without the Senate's goodwill, he cannot sign the Treaty which will constitute the League.

We regret the necessity of discussing continually this single controversial aspect of the League of Nations. The dispute obliges us all to dwell unduly on the League's aspect as pledged and prepared force. If that were ever to be its chief aspect we should cast for it no fortunate horoscope. It must be an idea in the hearts of mankind. It must have some visible form which appeals to the imagination even of the child, and incarnates an international thought. It must gather about itself all the half-grown efforts of the world towards every form of international organization. It will have, we hope, from the first, a well-developed economic side, so that it will confer on its members certain precise economic benefits, in the shape of some rudimentary charter of commercial freedom. If it can do this, it has gained a sanction independent of force, for it can withdraw these benefits from a disloyal member. But, reluctant as we are to over-emphasize the aspect of force, we entirely share the belief of Lord Grey, that the League can hardly be founded or maintained unless it is prepared to use force to back its central obligation. We respect the extreme pacifism which refuses in any circumstances to use force, though we cannot understand its failure to carry its own logic into complete philosophic anarchism.

But the pacifist who steps out of his academic study to oppose a project of this kind, advanced in a real world by fallible men to cure a desperate evil, must be invited to consider what the consequences of his success would be. Neither to-day nor to-morrow, if the League should be unarmed, will the world as we know it complacently trust to moral suasion. If security cannot be reached by ordered force, it will be sought in the pursuit of a balance of power. Europe will return to the old alliances and the old armaments. These things cannot co-exist with a League of Nations. They will destroy it—if, indeed, anyone troubled to create it. Torn by the old rivalries, the Powers could never contrive to make a Council of Conciliation workable. The idealist may bid us trust to moral suasion and the power of public opinion. Neither the politician nor the mob will obey him. The only thing that might have restrained them and might have given them confidence to rely on the better side of human nature, would have been the knowledge that an overwhelming coalition of law-abiding nations stood pledged and ready to back good faith, and defend the weak. This reinforcement the pacifist refuses. Yet he knows in his heart that he is too weak to prevent us from rushing once more to all the ancient fatal expedients of fear.

The third school of Conservation and Caution makes a show of worldly wisdom, to which the extreme idealists do not pretend. In fact, we believe that its position is

no less fatal to the success of a League of Nations. It attempts to meet the risk of aggression and treaty-breaking by a doubtful and incalculable counterpoise. Let the would-be aggressor know that an over-plus of force will certainly be mobilized against him, and he will never scheme to break the peace. Tell him, however, that in certain contingencies some Powers may possibly act against him, and all his ingenuity will be taxed to manage his aggression, so that this risk may not arise. That was the weakness of our own position in Europe in 1914. It is possible that if Germany at the opening of the crisis had known with certainty what she realized too late at the end, that we would certainly act with Russia and France, she would from the start have behaved with greater moderation. We say this not in any way to criticize Sir Edward Grey (for we ourselves opposed close ties of alliance), but to draw the honest historical lesson from the past. When the next world-war is threatened, the same doubt about America's attitude may lead to the same result. This unwillingness to assume an obligation looks like caution. It makes, in fact, the very danger which it dreads. By a firm intimation that she will act unhesitatingly with others against any Power which refuses to follow the procedure of the League, America may make it not merely morally but materially impossible for any Power to act aggressively. By leaving her action in doubt, she tempts the adventurer to play on her pacifism. But the consequences will be more serious than this. If Europe is deprived of the real guarantee which this pledge from America would bring, we shall all of us be driven to look for other guarantees. Shifting, fallible, risky, as the old-world alliance system is, the dread of isolation in this dangerous world will drive most, if not all, of the European Powers into alliances once more. For form's sake, as a concession to Pacifists, or by way of obliging Mr. Wilson, they might consent to sign the treaty of a League of Nations, emasculated of any obligation to act. Their real loyalty would not belong to the League; their real hopes would not be based on it, and it would lead, side by side with the armed alliances, a faint and scarcely remembered existence. So much the worse for Europe, the Conservative American may say. We might hesitate to beg America to come to our help, if we thought that she ran no danger herself. We share Mr. Wilson's view, however, that in the next war she will not be able to retain her neutrality. If she hesitates to back a League of Nations with her pledge, a next war there will probably—nay, infallibly—be. The bolder course is the more prudent course. A further point deserves American attention. If a really workable League of Nations can be created, it will be reasonable to invite us to make concessions in the law of warfare at sea. To a League, however, which gave us no real insurance against militarism, it is unlikely that we shall concede much. If we have to trust to our own right arm for safety, we shall not abandon any maritime method of proved value. The real choice lies between the balance of power and a bold development of co-operative power. Half-measures are worthless, for half-measures will not persuade any Power, whether naval or military, to forego the egoistic expedients by which alone safety can be ensured in the absence of dependable concerted action for mutual defence.

THE ATTRITION OF TRANSPORT.

WHEN the course of life is normal, it is difficult to realize the complexity of the factors upon which it depends. It is only when disease sets in that automatic functions approach the threshold of consciousness, and

we are compelled to appreciate the intricacy of the machinery and the delicacy of adjustment which underlie mere existence. Under the stress of the war we are similarly being forced to consider the fundamental services upon which modern social life rests. Before we can fight we must live, and war, like life, is reducible to certain radical assumptions. The question of the moment is transport. The manner in which it has gradually emerged and become dominant is worth consideration. Clearly, such a question could not have achieved critical importance in a moment. The power of "attrition" which has been patiently and terribly at work upon Nature's masterpiece, man, has also been corroding all the resources of the belligerents, and even of the world.

It is not generally realized that transport is a function of wealth. A fortune in a desert is of no more value than a livelihood. Wealth is ultimately a question of goods, and if there are no goods to purchase at hand, wealth is lessened to that extent. It is this which makes it a little strange that great neutral nations should not have objected to the submarine campaign. For it is clear that in so far as it limits the availability of purchasable commodities, it is depreciating their wealth. It is, indeed, a sin against the world, and this is but another of the many ways in which the world is involved in contemporary and future wars. Who in the future will wait a year or two before getting a sinking campaign under weigh? Where to-day ten ships are sunk, a hundred will be sunk in the future; and neutrals who have only a remote interest in the war will be involved because they will have their buying and selling restricted by the shortage of transport. A recent German estimate would make their annual rate of destruction at present to be 10 per cent. of the world's gross tonnage. And even if the war should end with no more than a 10 per cent. loss, that would be a very grave damage to the world. It is the natural course for Germany, having discovered how well she can involve influential neutrals under the guise of a correct following of international law, to develop her submarine campaign more and more until she can oblige them to bring pressure upon the Allies.

She does this the more readily that it inflicts the greatest immediate injury to the Allies. Transport, which is necessary for the well-being of peace, is necessary for the mere being of war. Tons of extraordinary contrivances must be accumulated day by day, and as they are shot away, must be replenished. Almost anywhere man could contrive a precarious existence from the soil; but for war the whole world must be laid under fee. Copper, iron, rubber, oil, cotton, various acids and chemical compounds, are necessary for the waging of successful warfare; and they cannot be brought directly from the place where they were found. They must be patiently gathered in one place, and cunningly wrought in another, or perhaps in several places, before they have reached that precise perfection which the wisdom of man requires in the thing he will destroy. Every link in the chain, from the mine or the field to the gun, is some form of transport. And the strength of the Allies is subject to this first restriction; their communications are not completely safe. The enemy has found a powerful reply to the Allied blockade. We pen him in by forbidding him the use of large ships. He is now destroying our large ships by the only type of vessel which we cannot fully prevent him using. War throws a greater strain upon transport for its immediate requisites, but it also makes heavier claims for functions that are normal in peace time. Armies consume far more food and clothing than the aggregate peace consump-

tion of the same body of men. There must, then, be more food and clothing produced, and transported to wherever it is required. But at the same time that it calls so many men to an increasing consumption of these staples of life, it withdraws them from the production of these very commodities, so that they can only be obtained from afar off, whereas once considerable quantities were produced at home. Here, again, transport is involved, and for the Allies this is chiefly sea transport. This is the weakest point in the Allied armor at the moment. There are numerous ways of dealing with the submarines which are playing such havoc with our shipping. The new mine-field may achieve a good deal, and the arming of merchantmen would be useful. There is also the recreation of our shipping. But the need for men in the trenches is taking labor from the shipbuilding yards; and it is not realized that we begin to approach a vicious circle. We intend to put more men and women in the yards to make more transport for making good the shortage of food. But we shall thereby make these very makers consume more food. We cannot get labor from people beyond a certain food value, and hence we seem to be consuming more resources in the effort to produce more.

But it is not only at sea that transport is shrinking. The regulations as to railway fares are a cogent reminder that travelling must be restricted, and the request not to send parcels to France for a week shows that what might be considered an inappreciable quantity of traffic is yet too great in times of stress. In Russia, most of the hardship of the war has been caused through an insufficient transport service. There is plenty of most staples; but their distribution has not been effected either uniformly or well. But the shortage of transport is most pressing, and most arresting in Germany. For the bulk of the war, it was customary for thoughtless people to imagine that Germany was persistently transferring her men from one front to another. The transport difficulty never seemed to interpose the same check upon the enemy that it obviously does upon the Allies. But now the transport crisis in Germany cannot be concealed. The production of railway material has sunk to almost half the normal amount when the strain on the railways is enormously increased. It is openly confessed that even materials of direct military value, such as benzol, cannot be produced in sufficient quantities owing to the shortage of railway waggons. Herr Batocki admits that transport difficulties prevent such stocks as were seized in Roumania having any immediate effect. The cause of the crisis seems to be the failure of copper, and also of the labor to work the small quantity available. But that it is real no one can doubt. There are reports of fierce struggles to enter the few trains that ply from the German towns to the suburbs, and the decline in available transport seems to be growing rapidly.

It is in its direct military bearing, however, that the question is of greater interest. Until now the submarine campaign has hardly touched the military side of the transport problem, though it is folly not to recognize that the attrition cannot go much further without involving our military co-operation in the war. But there is reason to believe that the shrinkage of transport is so great in Germany that it may directly involve defeat. Every recipe of victory includes mobility, and mobility is simply a question of transport. Unless we can move about vast numbers of men and guns rapidly, we cannot achieve the objective which our generals have set before them. Victory in the field depends almost entirely upon mobility, and German theory before the war had paid most attention to the resolution of this problem. At present, the transport behind the Allied armies has not shown signs of strain.

They suffer from the handicap of exterior lines; but they avoid the handicap which goes with interior lines—the tendency to place too much strain upon them. Germany has eked out her diminishing supplies of men by intricate fortifications, by guns, and by transport. But now this last defence seems failing in her hands, and it is much more critical for her. If she should have chosen the wrong place for her counter-concentration against the Allied offensive, she would be in a critical position unless her transport were still sufficient for her needs. Speaking of this question of transport, Major Moraht said: "We hope that in Germany the difficulties of organization will not impede at the critical moment the freedom of decision of the supreme command." Moraht is not an alarmist, and it is impossible that he should have used such words unless the facts fully warrant them. We may be quite sure that the importance of the transport problem will increase with every day's continuance of the war.

WHAT THE SPEAKER'S CONFERENCE MEANS.

THE deliberations of the Speaker's Franchise Conference have resulted in a series of recommendations, which, if carried out in their entirety, will effect reforms in our electoral law of first importance. They are indeed the result of a compromise, but it is clear that all parties alike are agreed as to the need of sweeping away the complications and limitations of the existing laws that have been chiefly answerable for the inadequacy of our representative system. The object of the Conference has been to establish a system under which the manhood (and, if Parliament is willing, the womanhood) of the nation will be able to exercise its influence over the Government of the country, and in order to achieve this, many points of detail in our electoral law have been dealt with during the past forty years that have failed to command the attention they deserved.

The principal recommendation lays it down that six months' residence shall be the main qualification for the franchise. Hitherto residence alone has not entitled any man to vote. In order to obtain a vote, a man must have been the owner or the tenant of some house, or a rated occupier, or a lodger, or an owner of land, or a freeman, or a member of a University, and as all these terms have involved legal definition, the Courts of law have been constantly enfranchising and disfranchising whole classes of men in their attempts to construe the intention of the legislature. The Conference have accepted the simple fact of residence as sufficient in itself, and, although they have retained the occupation vote for a limited purpose, in future, if these proposals are accepted, a person will only need to reside for six months in the same constituency in order to secure the rights of citizenship. With two exceptions, all the old franchises are to be swept away. The non-resident owner drops out altogether. In future he must content himself with voting only where he is a resident or an occupier of business premises. The ancient rights of freemen and liverymen disappear, as they ought to have done in 1832. The multiple occupation voter also takes his departure. The happy possessor of two or more homes will have to select one only in respect of which he will vote. There are, however, two exceptions to this rule, viz.: (1) the Conference propose to retain the franchise conferred by the occupation of business premises of the value of £10 a year, and (2) they maintain the University vote. A man who possesses either of these qualifications will be entitled to vote in respect of it, notwithstanding the fact that he also has a vote for

his residence. In this case a man may exercise two votes, provided they are for different constituencies. In no case is any man to have more than two votes.

From the point of view of those who stand for the principle of "one man, one vote," the last-named provision represents a great concession, and it is evidently one which owes its existence to the unanimity of the Conference. By the introduction of the residential qualification, there will be an addition of at least 25 per cent. to the present male electorate, and this will largely increase the electoral power of the poorer and less educated classes. There is therefore some justification for allowing extra political power to the far less numerous classes who represent the trade and business elements of the nation and its higher branches of learning. In the latter case, the Conference have added three University representatives in order to give members to the newer Universities, but they propose to democratize University representation by extending the right to vote to all persons who have taken a degree, and by providing for representation of the minority as well as of the majority. Thus, it is to be hoped that the University seats in future will cease to be the preserve of one political party, and will represent the divisions of political thought amongst men of science more accurately than they do at present.

The substitution of six months' residence for twelve months' occupation will increase largely the proportion of the adult men who will find their way on to the register of electors. But more remained to be done before there was secured an open door to every man who wishes to enter the ranks of qualified electors. One great defect in the old law has been that large numbers of persons found themselves disfranchised for long periods merely by reason of having changed their abode. The Conference propose to remedy this by enlarging the scope of the law of successive occupation, so that in future no person will lose his qualification, provided that his change of dwelling has occurred within the same borough, or within the same county, or from one such area into another area that is contiguous to it. This change will meet the case of thousands of persons who constantly move from city to suburb, and *vice versa*, and in itself will effect no inconsiderable addition to the lists of voters.

There is a further point in connection with this part of the subject which the Conference have not lost sight of. The period of qualification is altered from being one year prior to July 15th to six months prior to either July 15th or January 15th. This change facilitates enormously the attainment of the vote, and, under normal circumstances, will meet the case of the great majority of the population. But at the present moment things are not normal, and to require even six months' residence in a constituency would be to prevent the enfranchisement of our sailors and soldiers who, during the war, could not comply with this condition. Accordingly, special measures have been proposed which will allow men who are now fighting to have their names placed on the register. The provision for this purpose is as follows: The registration officials will be required to ascertain the names of all men of full age who ordinarily reside in their areas but who are serving with His Majesty's forces at the time of registration. These men will be put on the register without reference to the question as to whether they have been residing in the constituency during the six months required for other people. Such a provision as this will not, of course, enfranchise every soldier and sailor; but it will meet the case of the great majority of those who had a settled place of abode before they enlisted. Further, in the case of discharged soldiers who will have returned to civil life, the Conference propose that one

month's residence shall suffice, provided they were serving with the forces at any time within the six months prior to the date of making up the register.

The question arises as to how serving soldiers are to vote if an election occurs during their absence from home. The Conference have met this difficulty by introducing a scheme dealing generally with absent voters. This is a problem which has long agitated the representatives of certain industries, particularly that of merchant shipping, in which the conditions of employment constantly prevent men from recording their votes. The Conference suggest that where a man can prove that those conditions will render it probable that he will be compelled to be absent on the polling day, he may have his name placed on a list of absent voters, and he will be allowed to send his ballot-paper by post under conditions which will ensure that no one will know how he has voted. The list will be compiled at the same time as the ordinary register, and by this means electors such as seamen, railwaymen, or soldiers will be able to give notice of their desire to be classed as absent voters, and to record their votes, provided that they are not at too great a distance from home to allow of the return by post of the letters containing the ballot-papers.

The Conference suggest several reforms in the methods of registration and of election. The duty of registration will be placed upon public local officials, and a similar course will be taken with regard to the conduct of elections. The costs of registration will be divided between the local rates and the Exchequer, and by this means the Government will have to see that the work is done efficiently. The charges of the Returning Officer will be defrayed by the State, and the candidates will also be relieved of the cost of posting the polling-cards to the electors. The maximum expenditure allowed at elections will be drastically cut down. The expenditure by outside organizations upon advertising in support of a candidate will be discountenanced. All elections will be held on one day. In all these respects our representative system will be improved and simplified, and, it is to be hoped, made less expensive and less dependent upon the use of party organization and party funds.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

The Conference have recognized that no complete reform in the franchise, such as that which they submit, can be carried out without a redistribution of seats. It would be difficult in any case to leave untouched the arrangement which exists at present in which there are constituencies not ten miles apart, one of which contains 3,000 electors, and the other 53,000, and it would be quite impossible to do so when adding to those electorates 25 per cent. new male and possibly 50 per cent. new female voters. Accordingly, the Conference have made definite proposals based upon the principle that, as far as possible, every voter shall have equal electoral power. This principle, however, requires to be modified in its application by a second principle, namely, that, as far as possible, Parliamentary constituencies should be co-terminous with local government areas. Thus, it becomes necessary to give considerable latitude to the Boundary Commissioners, who will be charged with mapping out the new constituencies, and this is effected by laying down rules to the following effect—viz. (1), that *prima facie* a population of 70,000 is entitled to return one member to Parliament; (2) that any county or borough containing less than 50,000 shall cease to have separate representation; and (3) that a county or borough with a population between 50,000 and 120,000 shall have one member; with a population between 120,000 and 190,000 shall have two members; with a population between 190,000 and 260,000 shall have three members, and so on.

Accompanying this scheme of redistribution, the Conference recommend the partial adoption of the system of Proportional Representation. This method of election, which aims at securing representation to the minority, necessitates the combination of areas containing a population sufficient to return at least three members. Therefore, in rural districts, great tracts of the country would have to be included in a single constituency, and much difficulty would thereby arise in relation to organization and electioneering. Hence the Conference avoid applying this principle to the counties, but recommend it for London and for towns that are large enough to return three members. This will result in proportional representation being applied to about nineteen towns in England, and, in Scotland, to the cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow. London is to be divided into about fifteen or sixteen divisions, each returning three or four members. Some of the large urban districts may also be grouped together for this purpose. The method of voting in these constituencies will be by the single transferable vote, by which means a minority constituting from one-third to one-fourth of the electorate will be able to secure one of the three or four seats allotted to a constituency.

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE.

The Conference have not reached a unanimous finding on the subject of Woman's Suffrage. Nevertheless, their labors in this respect cannot be said to be abortive. A majority of their members were in favor of the principle of admitting women to the Parliamentary franchise; but the majority also held that the numbers of women to be enfranchised ought to be limited, and, accordingly, they have elaborated a scheme defining the method of limitation which they considered would be most satisfactory. The recommendations of the Conference in this respect will not commend themselves to everybody; but they undoubtedly constitute a basis upon which a reasonable system of woman's suffrage can be built up, and they mark an onward step in the progress of the movement, which should be of the utmost value to its supporters. Moreover, the result of the Conference's deliberations is evidence of a trend of opinion which undoubtedly prevails in the country. There is a general feeling that women should no longer be altogether debarred from exercising the franchise, and, at the same time, there is a not unreasonable hesitation about adding to the electorate, at a stroke of the pen, the entire adult female population. There are in the United Kingdom about fourteen million women over twenty-one years of age, and twelve and a-half millions of men, of whom eight millions are on the present Parliamentary register. If the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference are carried into effect with respect to male electors, the male electorate will be raised to between ten and eleven millions, and if the same system were applied to women, the female electors might number about twelve millions. Such a gigantic change may well justify the consideration which the Conference have given to the question of restricting in some measure the admission of women to the register, at any rate for a time.

There are two methods by which such restriction can be effected. The first and the simplest is by age; but here one is met by difficulties. Apart from the initial objection of differentiating between men and women, the figures present considerable obstacles, even if taken at comparatively high ages. The number of women over twenty-five years of age exceeds twelve millions, and those over thirty number more than ten millions. There are nearly eight and a-half million women of thirty-five years of age and upwards, and six and a-half millions over forty. It would be almost absurd

to take a higher age than thirty, and this would result in a female electorate of about nine millions.

The other method is by admitting women on a different qualification to that for men. The proposal which the more conservative suffragists have always advocated is to enfranchise for Parliamentary purposes those women only who now have the municipal vote. These comprise about one million persons. The objections to this proposal are two-fold. First, it cannot be held that the enfranchisement of only one million out of fourteen million women would give an adequate representation of female opinion throughout the country; and, secondly, as this class is restricted to individuals who are themselves the tenants of their dwellings or places of business, it excludes in practice all married women living with their husbands, and thus there would be shut out from the franchise those women who constitute the most responsible and experienced section of the female population, namely, wives and mothers.

Recognizing these objections, the Conference have recommended a combination of the two methods. They have accepted a limitation of age as applicable to every woman voter, and suggest either thirty or thirty-five years of age as the limit. But they also adopt a limitation by qualification, namely, the occupation of any premises, either as tenant in her own right or as the wife of the tenant.

Inasmuch as under the proposals at the Conference with regard to the municipal franchise, all tenants, male and female, will find their way on to the register of local government electors, there will be no difficulty in compiling a list of such persons and their wives for the purposes of the Parliamentary electorate. It must also be noticed that the municipal franchise will be based upon the tenancy of any premises, and will therefore include the separate occupation of any part of a dwelling-house. This scheme will probably admit some six million women to the Parliamentary franchise.

The proposals of the Conference present therefore a practicable and an effective method by which at least one-half of the adult female population may become entitled to vote for members of Parliament. It would provide an electorate of between ten and eleven million men and some six million women, and when it is found, as it certainly will be found, that the admission of women to electoral rights has none of the dangers which some people anticipate, it will not be difficult to extend the female franchise by placing it on precisely the same basis as that on which the male franchise is now about to rest.

W. H. DICKINSON.

A London Diary.

LONDON, FRIDAY.

APART from its other qualities, the German Note is a study in stupid savagery. But it is hardly worse than the Bethmann-Hollweg speech. I am told the Chancellor recently addressed some German representative men in a private speech, admitting that the interior situation was deplorable, that the potato crop was a failure, and that the country could not hold out long, though the army might be sustained for two years. Therefore the country had better put all its force into the submarine campaign. But how badly the avowal has been made; how coarse the mentality which expounds it! German tactlessness is something beyond a crime; it is a kind of super-offence, which ordains and gives birth to all the others. The nation which shouted "Peace" and "Victory" in one breath now takes another to

renounce Belgium and announce a fresh orgy of frightfulness. Thus moderation is silenced, and the guns speak again. When will they cease? I see no hope but America; no rescuing figure but her President. His personality, indeed, grows, in spite of the efforts of our untutored Press to belittle it. Show his portrait on a cinema screen, and the people cheer. Speak of the United States as the sponsor of a new World-order, and at last imagination begins to kindle. Slow are these fires; but they burn. I am convinced that in each country they will finally beat down the war-flame which would consume civilisation.

THAT in the face of this German outrage the President will now act strongly, those who know him best firmly believe. He is a great politician—his friends and his foes unite in that description of him—but I never heard him accused of weakness. He has sharp edges to his character, as to his intellect; and they are now applied to an issue to which there is a plain "Yea" or "Nay." The talk of his pro-Germanism is trash, hawked by the journalistic pedlars in violence who do their best to ruin our cause in America by outdoing German truculence. With a strong but moderate case, based in the main on the Asquith-Grey presentments of it, we have America and the President with us "all the time." If Germany forces war on America, as her arch-criminals threaten, it *will* be war. If the Entente stands for a free Europe, and there is a possibility of securing it, a basis of agreement and common action will be found. As I write, the first result is thought to be the more likely. It is inconceivable that Germany did not count the risks of her order to America to keep off the high seas while she murders at will, and if she did, her action must be the fruit either of the desperate calculation that her internal resources are drawing to an end, and that she may just as well succumb to the Entente plus America as to the Entente alone, or of the cool calculation that she can defy America without risk to her chance of cutting off our supplies, and forcing us and the world to a bad peace. In any case a new issue arises; and the nation must meet it, confident of itself and of America's good faith and the power of the man who speaks for her.

LORD MILNER's visit to Russia has long been an open secret, but it has put the cap on the eccentricities of our new style of government. Who governs and how? There is no Cabinet. There is no regular War Council. There is no concerted policy. There is no general responsibility to Parliament. As far as one can see, what responsibility there is descends in this fashion:—

Mr. George.

Secretariat.

The Departments.

The heads of these last bodies have become mere officials devoid of political status. They disagree as the permanent heads may disagree, and one or all of them may be dismissed or may resign. But our First Consul would remain, and no one else seems greatly to matter. And yet, in the last resort, it is clear that the House of Commons retains its inalienable power of discrediting the Administration as a whole. So long as it is a Sovereign body, and retains the control of supplies, it is supreme. The Government, in the act of breaking the formal tie between Parliament and the Ministry, acknowledges its reality, and sets up an elaborate machinery for retaining control of the body from which, so long as Britons are Britons, every Government must draw sustenance and the breath of life. The change, therefore, may be no great change after all. The

Commons can force Minister after Minister to account, until, in effect, it has restored the old doctrine of collective responsibility.

WHEN I was in Egypt the memory of Lord Cromer was beginning to fade, for Lord Kitchener took a good deal of the stage, and looked well in the centre of it. Yet the administrator felt his defects, and sometimes sighed for a more Liberal Cromer, or, let me say, a Cromer who could be born again and take up his work at the point at which the civil statesman had left it. With a little more time and a rather younger mind, it was thought Cromer would have given Egypt a Code and a Constitution. Certainly he did not mean to leave her with the Capitulations and the Mixed Courts; less probably he would have given her a University. His fault was his coldness. The true confession of his book as of his work is that he never tried to win the people's heart. Evidently he thought that that multiple organ was not worth winning. He did not even care for Egyptian antiquities; in this respect a contrast to Lord Kitchener, who was sometimes credited with a too personal devotion to them. Tact was never Lord Cromer's strong point (though he thought it was), yet even the perverse Khedive and the unsatisfactory Nationalist might have been better for a little more sympathetic diplomacy from the just, strong, but not expansive Cromer. His real efflorescence was in his writing. The literature of statesmanship has produced few better books than "Modern Egypt."

I NOTICE an article in the "Outlook," which covertly though courteously worded, makes some entirely untrue statements or insinuations concerning this journal. The first is that there was some pre-knowledge in THE NATION of the President's Address to the Senate, or even a "common origin"—whatever that may mean—of that document and the article criticized. For this there is not a tittle of foundation, and it is an insult to Mr. Wilson to suggest it. The second is that THE NATION's reading of the Allied Note accepted the implied charge against it that it committed us to the loss of millions of lives for the purpose of "re-mapping Europe," whereas the article was devoted to a rebuttal of that charge. The third is that THE NATION or the Note accepted the re-inclusion of Alsace-Lorraine in the German Empire. A fourth dark insinuation is that the Editor of this paper had some knowledge of Herr Ballin's visit to this country before the war. This, again, is absolutely untrue. We had our own views of what was possible in the way of an Anglo-German accommodation before the war. But I think I may say that for years before that event, no British journalist, Liberal or Tory, abstained more completely from communication with German agents, high or low, in this country or in Germany, than the writer of these lines.

THE leaders of the Women's Movement are inclined, I think, provisionally to accept the Conference's scheme of enfranchisement, largely because they see that it must be modified in their favor. You can hardly have a property basis for the women's vote, and a flesh and blood basis for the men's. You cannot maintain so wide an age-space between the man and the woman voter as 21 and 30 or 35, the one marking the end of the educational period for the best-trained male minds in the nation, the other going far beyond it, and post-dating by years the average period for marriage and full settlement in life. These anomalies will be argued, and if possible, abated. But there will not be obstruction.

A WAYFARER.

Life and Letters.

THE EMPIRE-BUILDER.

THE administration of India evolved long ago into a vast, anonymous, impersonal machine. Viceroy come and go, and leave their traces behind them, but the adventurous age of the pioneer is ended. Of the real workers, who in Council and Presidency shape the policy and wield the authority of the King-Emperor, the masses at home know nothing, and the educated world but little more. There is scope for personality in the new dependencies, but most of them lie far afield, beyond the track of the tourist and the ken of the journalist. From all this silent and almost nameless exercise of power, the career of Lord Cromer stood out unique and splendid, the single exception. It was not that Egypt presented the most interesting or most important Imperial task of his generation. Rather it was that the task was new, that it lay for nearly twenty years in the storm-zone of European high politics, and, above all, that countless witnesses, tourists, journalists, archaeologists, and seekers after health visited the land in which he worked. His was a masterful personality, but the real field of its ascendancy came to lie, as the years of his tenure of power lengthened out, rather in England than in Egypt. He became the centre of a legend, the typical figure of the modern Imperialism which dominated our foreign policy for a generation before the Boer War. The modern Empire-BUILDER must learn to reign in two elements. It is well if he can gain the confidence of the subject-population, but it is indispensable that he should win the trust of the sovereign people at home.

Lord Cromer had to deal in the early years with Governments of both parties which did not wish to make an occupation of Egypt perpetual, and with Liberal opinion all the time, which hesitated first over the occupation itself, and then over his omission to create any real beginnings of self-government. He won his battle by his own firmness of purpose, by his adroitness in handling men who were nominally his superiors, by the literary skill of his annual reports, and his power of creating a real popular interest in his problem. That he was the autocrat in Egypt was no miracle: he had the British Army behind him. That he became the real ruler of Egypt was a triumph of personality, rather because he made a legend which no Cabinet in London dare disturb. His ascendancy, in short, was won over his own countrymen. Very little of his power over the Egyptians was due to his personal qualities. He did not wield a human magnetism over them, as Lord Kitchener certainly did. He never tried to govern by private or public persuasion. He scarcely troubled to seek contact with the native mind. Though he was a good linguist, and learned Modern Greek in his first official position in the Ionian Isles, it is significant that he had never tried to learn Arabic. The East did not allure him, as it allured all our greatest administrators, and the tone of his "Modern Egypt," especially towards Islam, is curiously external and even hostile. His immense success was not a psychological triumph. It was that of a very competent but rather hard intelligence, which set up the framework of an orderly Government as an engineer erects his plant.

When Sir Evelyn Baring first became, as Consul-General, the real ruler of Egypt, he would have summed up his aim in four words: To make Egypt solvent. All that he did was directed to this limited purpose, and all that he left undone was omitted, because it had no

direct relation to this one absorbing end. It was not a task of great complexity or hopeless difficulty. The Khedives who ruled before the spendthrift Ismail, had been good husbandmen, and the country was, by Oriental standards, thriving and progressive before he mortgaged its resources to usurers. There is a good deal of truth in Mr. Shaw's dictum that the real creators of the contemporary prosperity of Egypt were the ever-laborious peasantry, the generous Nile, and the opulent soil which yields three crops in every year. Lord Cromer's task was to sweep away the artificial and accumulated hindrances to the predestined prosperity of Egypt. That was a great administrative achievement. It created order and security, and the elements of justice. It diminished, though it could not extirpate, the rooted native habits of corruption and cruelty. Beyond this achievement lay his daring engineering works, which extended the area of cultivation and provided for the now fast-increasing population. The limited aim of achieving solvency was reached early in this long career, and there followed the equally successful effort to increase the production of the country. The best side of all this good work lay in the fact that, from first to last, the burdens of the peasantry were immensely lightened, whether one looks at their liability to taxation or to the service of the corvée. That there was a relative increase in the prosperity of the peasantry, as well as an immense increase in the total wealth of the country, admits of no doubt. But no one who is familiar with the aspect and interior of an Egyptian village will care to dwell with much complacency on this subject. The most industrious peasantry, working on the richest soil in the world, lived still in mud hovels, and owned, beside its few pots and pans, its store of maize, and a straw mat or two, literally nothing but the blue cotton gowns on its back. The native landlord, exploiting one of the worst systems of land tenure in the world, the native or Greek usurer, and the foreign financier and speculator were more intimately acquainted with this startling new prosperity than the hard-driven fellah, enshackled in a mesh of debt and "truck" and semi-servitude.

Lord Cromer came of a great banking family. His first contact with Egypt had been as a Controller of the Debt; his administrative experience in India had been as Financial Member of the Council. He was from first to last the economist, and his view of politics (as we realized in his staunch adherence to Free Trade) was both in its limitations and in its positive inspirations, that of the older Manchester School. He was penetrated by the tradition of *laissez faire*: he was an Individualist to the backbone: he stood aloof from all the modern expansion of the idea of the State. This partly explains the worst defect of his long term of power—the neglect of education. A young national State, like Bulgaria, when it came to its kingdom and got rid of the Turks, thought first of education, and at any cost proceeded to build up a national system. Lord Cromer actually economized on education, cut down expenditure, and in many ways did less for it than the Khedives had done. One pound in £81 of its annual expenditure was what Egypt gave to education in his latter years. Prussia spends an eighth of her Budget on it, and even poor Serbia a fifteenth. The result was that he left Egypt without a true university, with only four Governmental secondary schools for boys: and with just 4 per cent. of the Moslem population able to read and write. When he pointed to the crudity of the Nationalists, the childishness and irresponsibility of the native Press, the want of enlightenment of the existing consultative elected bodies, the general absence of public spirit and public interest, he had a strong case. The intellectual level, even of the

wealthier Egyptians, is abysmally lower than that of any Balkan State. But how much of this is due to the original poverty of the intellectual soil, the distressing legacy of history, and the fetters of Islam, and how much to the fact that the Occupation had paid much less attention to fertilizing men's minds than to irrigating the soil? It developed Egypt rather than the Egyptians. In the years since Lord Cromer's departure, a good deal has been done to remedy his omissions. Sir Eldon Gorst, in his brief and rather unhappy term, did much for education, and set up in the totally unregulated and grossly exploited factories and gineries that Factory Act which Lord Cromer had always refused. Lord Kitchener struck decisively at some of the abuses of usury and land-tenure which had obstructed the fellah's progress. Both of them interfered far more drastically with the liberty of the Press and of public agitation than Lord Cromer had ever done. His comparative moderation there revealed the good side of his *laissez-faire* training. But both of his successors had a more constructive conception of the positive benefits of good government.

It was only on the negative side that Lord Cromer inherited the Manchester tradition. His refusal to create a Ministry of Agriculture was a typical illustration of this tendency. In his attitude towards self-government his position was more modern. The real reason why in all his four-and-twenty years he had done substantially nothing to promote Egyptian self-government, was clearly revealed only in his later writings. He held that it was useless and even mischievous to attempt anything until the fetters of the Capitulations had been removed. He saw that the immense financial interests represented by the numerically small European population could not be deprived of the double protection, first of their extra-territorial rights, and, secondly, of the British overlordship, without some effective substitute. His proposal was apparently to set up some elected Upper Chamber, chosen by these foreign residents, which should (presumably by some power of veto) safeguard their interests and those of the investors behind them, against the native interests represented in a Lower Egyptian Chamber. We touch in this scheme the real modern problem of Imperialism—another phase of the problem which produced the clash of Uitlander and Boer in the Transvaal. Everywhere in a modern empire, the ruling Imperial interest is to-day that of the capital which exports itself to build railways, to promote irrigation, or to develop the production of raw material. Everywhere this imported capital, represented only by a handful of white residents, stands opposed to the mass-interests of the native population, which will swamp it if it can achieve democratic self-government. Everywhere the Imperial arm stands uneasily poised between its class and race affinity to the foreign financier, and its protective duties to the native masses. The case is often complicated, as it was in Egypt, by the fact that at present the only native element which is capable of using the instrument of self-government, is not at bottom representative of the masses, but is itself as crudely egoistic in its defence of its class privileges as the least enlightened of foreign financiers. For this problem Lord Cromer had a solution which seemed to recognize frankly the supremacy of the foreign capitalists in this clash of interests. How in the long run the Empire of the future will solve this problem, the biggest and the most perplexing that confronts us, we cannot guess. It will not be on his lines, if we retain any faith in democracy. He stated the problem, but he left it unsettled. He stands out the ablest, the most typical, the most famous figure in an age of capitalistic Imperialism whose final evolution none of us can read.

AMERICA'S ARCADY.

At a crisis in the ten-years' Trojan War, Jove and the other gods, although so deeply implicated, agreed to forget all about it, and went off to a feast among the blameless Ethiopians, with whom they stayed a fortnight. So let us imitate the gods (our best examples) at least for twenty minutes, and seek some solace among the blameless denizens of Appalachian mountains, taking Mr. Cecil Sharp as our guide, to whose heart the music of untutored innocence is dear. The other day he told the English Folk Dance Society something about those mountains, but we suppose not one in a hundred thousand of full-grown Englishmen has ever yet heard their name, though they extend over a region as large as the British Isle and two-thirds of Ireland put together.

And, indeed, it was but last year that our guide discovered them, making his discovery only just in time, much as Bishop Percy was only just in time to rescue his book of poetic relics from the housemaid's fire, and Walter Scott was only just in time to save the Border minstrelsy, which he touched, and, unfortunately, adorned. It was one of those coincidences that almost compel us to believe in a Pre-established Harmony, or in a "Fors Clavigera," which suddenly and unawares presents the tools to him who can use them. We all know how, with patient and enthusiastic research, Mr. Cecil Sharp had for years gone to and fro among the English counties from Northumbria to Somerset seeking what remnants of folk-song or ballad he might preserve. On a sudden he found himself translated to the Appalachian mountains, where he had but to stand still in any homestead, and the songs and ballads so diligently sought fell thick about him as forest leaves. In less than three months he transcribed four hundred, with words and notes, from unwritten tradition, and now he returns for more. As when the persistent miner, long toiling upon the rocks of windy Johannesburg, and finding here and there but a little yellow dust, drives his pick suddenly into a pocket—a pocket of gold! So he.

We may call the natives of this mountain seclusion Appalachians, for short, though they claim no distinctive blood or race. They are just Americans whom Time has forgotten, and Progress never hustled. In all, they number about five millions, if you include the small towns around the feet of the mountains, or three millions within the stricter confines. Judging from their songs and language, Mr. Cecil Sharp thinks their pastoral fathers started from the English Borderland about two centuries ago (say, three generations later than those rather monotonous Pilgrim Fathers), and they seem to have landed at Charleston, in South Carolina's "sultry clime." Finding that negro slavery even then left no room for their labor, the pick of them made their way gradually towards the far-off mountains, the tail-end of the Alleghanies, leaving the less energetic behind to degenerate into the "poor whites" or "white trash" of to-day. Over the large mountain tract where the Carolinas and Virginias (memorials of a monarchy left behind) meet with Kentucky and Tennessee, they distributed their families, stockading the isolated settlements against Indians and enormous hordes of wolves. In that manner they have dwelt up to this day, almost unchanged, except that Indians and wolves have disappeared.

During the Civil War, it is true, they suffered a kind of martyrdom; for, though there were no negro slaves in their territory (and there are no negroes still) since cotton will not grow there, they found themselves in the very thick of the slave-owning States, and from their first arrival they had abhorred slavery. But except during those few years of miserable persecution, civilization has hardly touched them. Railways run to Ashville and one or two other points within a few

hundred miles of their central innocence; but roads are few, and such as exist are of the Balkan kind—rocky tracks laid down with boulders, or meandering up the beds of mountain torrents. Their manner of life might be called Albanian, for they do not gather into villages, but dwell in isolated homesteads as at first, and their houses (built of logs, unlike the little Albanian fortresses of rock) often have no windows, being constructed for warmth, requiring no light to read by (since few can read), and having plenty of fresh air outside. Also the Appalachians, till quite lately, practised the blood-feud, as the Albanians do still, that being their chief method of maintaining law and order. And they still keep their heavy old guns—the same, we suppose, as they used for summary justice, or for defence against Indians and wolves—though a few have advanced to rifles.

They do not gather into communal or tribal assemblies for the punishment of crime or the settlement of disputes, as the Albanians gather when a blood-feud appears to have killed enough people to satisfy justice. Compared with more advanced races, indeed, crime among them appears to be very uncommon. Public offences hardly occur, except in the form of "illicit stills." They do not drink; they make no wine or beer; but some of them like to distil their own spirit in the ancestral manner, and the State exciseman embodies for them the uncomfortable existence of law and police. By building a house across the very frontier of two States, wary distillers can escape by rapidly passing from one room to another at the sight of approaching law. But everyone cannot build upon a frontier, and Mr. Cecil Sharp was warned that, as a stranger, he might be mistaken for an exciseman, and receive a chilly welcome.

The Appalachians' other fear was that, like a missionary and most visitors, he might be coming to improve them. Against improvers the gorge of natural man always rises. All of us feel as Thoreau says:—

"If I knew for a certainty that a man was coming to my house with the conscious design of doing me good, I should run for my life as from that dry and parching wind of the African deserts which fills the mouth and nose and ears and eyes with dust till you are suffocated, for fear I should get some of his good done to me—some of its virus mingled with my blood."

Mr. Cecil Sharp's danger was increased because, at a few points, missionaries zealous for the improvement of these Arcadians—"children of the dark earth"—have already appeared, and collected a few houses round wooden chapels and schools where American culture is purveyed. But when they found that he only wanted to live among them and hear them sing, they welcomed him naturally and with a dignity of manner, which, like the rest of their life, dates from the England of two centuries ago.

All sing. Men, women, and children all sing, and their singing is as unconscious as the grandeur of their natural manners. Apparently, they keep certain songs for special occupations, for a woman, having forgotten part of a song, said she would remember it all right if she was driving the cow. Hitherto their singing remains untainted by music-halls and even by hymns. They sing the traditional folk-songs and ballads of England and the Borderland, which our own country people have almost lost. Mr. Cecil Sharp found thirty-seven ballads included in Child's collection, beside an extraordinary number of others, as we mentioned. "Fair Annie," "The Wife of Usher's Well," "The Three Ravens," "Young Hunting," "The Cruel Mother," and many more that most of us know are great favorites. Of course, they all vary, both from the versions now printed in our collections, and among themselves; for it is the character of the folk-song to be always growing and changing, like everything else so long as it is alive. Of

the familiar "Raggle-taggle Gipsies," on which Browning founded "The Flight of the Duchess," Mr. Cecil Sharp discovered two quite different versions, with separate and beautiful tunes. In one of them the first verse runs:—

"It was late in the night when the Squire came home,
Inquiring for his lady;
His servant made a sure reply,
'She's gone with the gipsy Davy.'
Rattle tum a gipsum, gipsum,
Rattle tum a gipsum Davy."

There we see the entire indifference to the number of syllables in a line, the carelessness about rhyme (later in the same ballad "round you" rhymes with "honey"), the oral corruption of "Rattle tum," and the persistent tradition of "Davy," who is always turning up in the gipsy song, and possibly was a real gipsy of distinctive attraction.

Perhaps Mr. Cecil Sharp's happiest moment came in discovering "The False Knight upon the Road," of which Motherwell's collection contains the only version hitherto known. It is a mixture of "the riddle ballad" and "the temptation ballad," and is the only ballad with a word of introduction. The tune is unusually fine, the false knight's questions being set in a sinister tone, suited to a power of evil. We may quote the version whole:—

"A knight met a child in the road.

'O where are you going to?' said the knight in the road.
'I'm a-going to my school,' said the child, as he stood.
He stood and he stood, and it's well because he stood.
'I'm a-going to my school,' said the child as he stood.

'O what are you going there for?' said the knight in the road.

'For to learn the word of God,' said the child, as he stood.
Refrain.

'O what have you got there?' &c.

'I have got my bread and cheese,' &c.
Refrain.

'O won't you give me some?' &c.

'No, ne'er a bite nor crumb,' &c.
Refrain.

'O I wish you was on the sands,' &c.

'Yes, and a good staff in my hands,' &c.
Refrain.

'O I wish you was in the sea,' &c.

'Yes, and a good boat under me,' &c.
Refrain.

'O I think I hear a bell,' &c.

'Yes, and it's ringing you to hell,' &c.
Refrain.

So the blameless Appalachians live, singing the old ballads to the old tune on a "gapped" scale of five notes only, planting patches of maize for bread, keeping herds of wild little hogs for meat, growing apples and tomatoes for other food, and tobacco for chewing with all its horrible accompaniments, though they think it ill-mannered to smoke. But for one or two distant stores, they keep themselves, have no commerce, and no money, but exchange by barter. Without American accent, they speak an old-fashioned English—"ugly" for harmful (as we still say "an ugly wound"), "stout" for strong (as we still say "stout-hearted"), "tarry" for stay (as the Bible says). They know the Bible, and those who can read, we suppose, read it aloud at their meetings. In spite of their songs, all are strict Calvinists, and some have taken to a "Holiness," something like the Salvation Army.

They develop very young, marriage being usual between twelve and fourteen; but, fortunately, one divorce (no more) is arranged without trouble or stigma, and illegitimate births seem to be unknown. Besides the noble manners of our ancestors, they retain their

unwashed habits. They have lost all tradition of the sea, but asked Mr. Cecil Sharp for information about it; also about the pyramids, the present war, mummies, and locks on the Panama Canal. They like to converse and gain general information, but, valuing leisure, they are in no hurry about progress. When asked what they do with their leisure, Mr. Cecil Sharp said, "They ponder." Envious Appalachians!

Letters to the Editor.

THE PAST OF THE TCHECHO-SLOVAKS.

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—Mr. Buxton expects and wishes a discussion and explanation on the point of the Allies' programme demanding the liberation of the Tchechs and the Slovaks. Allow me to make some statements of facts which Mr. Buxton has formulated either incorrectly or unclearly. It is not correct that the Allies previously demanded only restitution, reparation, and guarantees; British statesmen, from the very beginning, also have defended the rights of small nations, and have demanded the crushing of Prussian militarism. These demands have been maintained in the answer to Germany. The Note to President Wilson expresses this aim in a more concrete form. Mr. Buxton says that the liberation of Bohemia was hitherto unheard of by the British public. I doubt whether this can be correct, because the British public must know that Bohemia waged two revolutions (1618 and 1848) to attain her liberation, and that since 1848 the Bohemians struggled for independence. Mr. Buxton thinks that the union of the Bohemians with the Slovaks is a dream of a small body of experts. In fact, there is a strong party in both countries working for this union, and after the outbreak of war the Bohemian and Slovak colonies in the Allied and neutral countries, to the number of perhaps a million, proclaimed this union as the national programme. Mr. Buxton asserts that the demand for complete liberation is not universal among the Slav nations of Austria. This statement, too, so far as it is clear, is not correct. Not only the Bohemians, but the Poles and the South Slavs demand their independence; and the Ruthenes, if their programme is to be realized, desire it also.

Mr. Buxton is against the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary if the nations in Russia remain unliberated, but just these nations do not demand their liberation from Russia, there being, in fact, only one acute national question in Russia—the Polish. A party among the Lithuanians is now, during the war, working against Russia; the rest of the many small nations and fragments of nations do not aspire to liberation. Mr. Buxton fears an immense extension of the task of the Allies and an indefinite extension of the war, and the further loss of perhaps half-a-million British lives. If Mr. Buxton is of opinion (he does not say so) that the Italians, the South Slavs, and Poles must be liberated, then it cannot be true that the liberation of Bohemia would demand this great sacrifice; the dismemberment of Austria is postulated by these aims, the liberation of Bohemia does not impose new sacrifices. Mr. Buxton maintains the claims of nationality, but he thinks the rights of nationality could be attained by internal Home Rule. Austria-Hungary is a living proof that Home Rule is not sufficient. As far as Bohemia is concerned, the Bohemian programme does not only claim the right of nationality, but also of independence, as Bohemia has the same right to independence as Hungary. Finally, Mr. Buxton fears that the break-up of Austria would destroy the balance of power. Perhaps, but according to the programme of the Allies, and to that of all truly democratic and progressive politicians, Europe wants, not a balance of power, but a reconstruction on the principle of equality and justice. Just this so-called balance of power plunged Europe, even the whole of mankind, into this war. To sum up, the question whether Austria-Hungary is to be dismembered is, in fine, equal to the question, whether one family (the Habsburgs) is of more value to Europe and mankind than nine nations, and whether Europe and mankind will continue to tolerate an imperialistic despotism which reactionary

politicians have surrounded with the halo of historical divine rights and legitimism.—Yours, &c.,

T. G. MASARYK (Prof.).

21, Platts Lane, N.W. January 27th, 1917.

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—Professor Masaryk says that, contrary to my assertion, British statesmen demand more than "restitution, reparation, and guarantees," and that "from the very beginning" they held out hopes to Bohemia. I must refer the Professor to Mr. Lloyd George.

The Professor raises interesting objections to my argument, for an answer to which it is only necessary to refer your readers to the standard British writers on the Austro-Hungarian question. Their opposition to the break-up of Austria has been based on invincible arguments of permanent application. Does not the Professor, moreover, avoid the really vital question, "Is the independence of Bohemia desirable?" On this question I yield to none in zeal for the "rights of nationality." The Professor says they are not enough. We British Home-Rulers, who intend to grant them to Ireland, think they are. We deny that the Irish, whose position at the heart of a larger State is similar to that of Bohemia, have the "right" to an independent army, with power to attack its neighbors or invite a rival Great Power to utilize its government.—Yours, &c.,

NOEL BUXTON.

12, Rutland Gate. January 30th, 1917.

WOMEN AND THE TRADE UNION FUTURE.

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—The "Times" articles on the Trade Union Outlook, which were criticized in THE NATION, of January 27th, conspicuously ignore the whole question of the trade union position as it affects women. Yet if that already well-worn phrase, industrial reconstruction, is to have any significance after the war, it is obviously necessary to examine the common ground which exists not only between employers and trade unions, but also between trade unions and women workers; for only upon this common ground can industrial reconstruction in any real sense begin.

Both Government and employers are bound, by the Munitions Act and the Munitions Amendment Act, to turn out women from all industrial occupations and processes to which, according to the ruling practice, they were not admitted before the war; but it is obvious that the fulfilment of this pledge depends upon the will of the trade unions. Women must be turned out if the trade unions demand it. Of the important unions enumerated in the "Times" articles as having accepted the Government compact at the beginning of the war, some have already opened their membership to women: for example, the Dockers' Union (Transport Workers' Federation), some of the unions in the Federation of Furnishing Trades, and above all the National Union of Railwaymen, and the Railway Clerks' Association, which admit women on equal terms with men. In the industries in which women are thus admitted to the men's unions it is unlikely that an attempt will be made to turn them out of employment after the war. But the union of the engineering trade—where the influx of women has been far greater than in any other industry—has consistently refused to admit them. The women are therefore enrolled, by arrangement with the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, in the National Federation of Women Workers, and about 10 per cent. of the total number (half a million) of women munition workers have been thus organized. This leaves the way clear for the Engineers to insist upon the fulfilment of the Government pledges and the expulsion of women after the war.

But the important question is not merely whether the Engineers will demand this fulfilment, but whether, from their own point of view, they will be wise in demanding it. The writer of the "Times" articles shows that the only alternative to absolute restoration of pre-war conditions is a new agreement, and that the Government, in abandoning their promises, must see to it that in this new agreement the interests of the trade unions as well as the interests of the employers are fully protected. What about the interests of the third party in the present industrial alliance?

Good wages and good conditions of work are as

important for women as for men: to obtain good wages and good conditions, women, as well as men, need organization, and to make their organization fully effective, women, as well as men, need political power. If women are excluded from the men's unions and turned out of the better paid and more highly skilled occupations, the risks of undercutting, and of the presence of a large body of unorganized and ill-paid workers will be intensified. If, on the other hand, women are admitted to full political rights and to membership of existing trade unions on equal terms with men, and are recognized as one of the parties concerned in whatever new "industrial charter" is to supersede the Government agreement, then real industrial reconstruction becomes a possibility.—Yours, &c.,

ELINOR BURNS.

January 31st, 1917.

"THE ONE WAY OUT."

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—I am not always inclined to follow the line you take in current politics; but with your treatment of the subject of President Wilson's Note—and of peace proposals generally—I find myself in complete accord; and I am indeed glad to see the sound principles you advocate placed so unequivocally before the public. In your second article (last week) the following passage occurs: "His (the enemy's) after-realization of what he has lost is the best guarantee of future peace." This is true, so far as it goes; but I do not think that, here or elsewhere, sufficient stress has been laid upon the fact that—win or lose—Germany will be so prostrated after the war, that, for many years to come, she cannot be a source of danger to her neighbors. May I emphasize this contention from personal experience? In 1872, I spent three months in Germany, living with Germans, and learning their language. The German armies had been victorious, the French indemnity was being paid. Yet on all sides were signs of sorrow and discontent. The salary of the Professor with whom I lived had been raised (so he told me) 70 per cent., but he was a poorer man. Owing to the rise in the cost of living, he and his wife had been forced to cut down expenses, and to take in as a paying guest a young "Englander." There were halt and lame in the streets. There were fathers and mothers who refused, in their bereavement, to leave their homes and appear in public; and little indeed could be seen of that prosperity which one would associate with the conclusion of a victorious war. "Never again," was the cry of those people. "Never again will we allow our rulers to drag our nation into war." That was in '72. That generation has passed away, and the men who vowed that victorious Germany should never fight again, have gone. Their sons may now learn from experience how bitter is the fruit—not of victory—but of failure, and even of defeat.

Plenty will not come simultaneously with peace, and the load of taxation will be intolerable. So that, whatever may be the outcome of this war, we may be assured on one point—that Germany will be prostrated, financially and physically paralyzed, her people nauseated with bloodshed, unwilling and unable to take the offensive for years to come. And during those years, who can say what may happen? Disintegration of the German Empire? Well, perhaps not that; but there are abundant grounds for the conjecture that the Hohenzollern dynasty will have ceased to exist.—Yours, &c.,

E. H. CLUTTERBUCK.

Hardenhuish, Chippenham. January 30th, 1917.

THE SCANDAL OF THE DISABLED.

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—While fully agreeing with all you say in your article under the above title in THE NATION of January 27th, I venture to suggest that many—perhaps most—of our disabled soldiers require something more than "re-education" and training whereby they may become "skilled men, with a definite place in the world of industry." Would not many of them welcome education of a kind which would give them more insight into the industrial system in which they are going to play their part, and into the many industrial problems which await solution?

It is in the belief that education of this kind will supply

a real need that Ruskin College proposes, before long, to open at Oxford a school for disabled soldiers, with a course of study, lasting for four, eight, or twelve weeks, on "Some Problems of Labor in Industry." This course will be carried on by means of lectures, study groups, individual tuition, private reading under guidance, and essay-writing.—Yours, &c.,

H. SANDERSON FURNESS
(Principal of Ruskin College).

January 30th, 1917.

[Lack of space compels us to hold over until next week a letter by Mr. Forman, commenting on our article, "The Tchecho-Slovaks."—ED. THE NATION.]

Poetry.

A SOLDIER'S TESTAMENT.

If I come to die
In this inhuman strife,
I grudge it not, if I
By laying down my life
Do aught at all to bring
A day of charity,
When pride of lord or king
Un-powerful shall be
To spend the nations' store,
To spill the peoples' blood;
Whereafter evermore
Humanity's full flood
Untroubled on shall roll
In a rich tide of peace,
And the world's wondrous soul
Uncrucified increase.
But if my life be given
Merely that lords and kings
May say: "We well have striven!
See! where our banner flings
Its folds upon the breeze
(Thanks, noble sirs, to you!).
See! how the lands and seas
Have changed their pristine hue."
If after I am dead
On goes the same old game,
With monarchs seeing red
And ministers aflame,
And nations drowning deep
In quarrels not their own,
And peoples called to reap
The woes they have not sown;
If all we who are slain
Have died, despite our hope
Only to twist again
The old kaleidoscope—
Why then, by God! we're sold!
Cheated and wronged! betrayed!
Our youth and lives and gold
Wasted—the homes we'd made
Shattered—in folly blind,
By treachery and spite,
By cowardice of mind
And little men and light!
If there be none to build
Out of this ruined world
The temple we have willed
With our flag there unfurled,
If rainbow none there shine
Across these skies of woe,
If seed of yours and mine
Through this same hell must go,
Then may my soul and those
Of all who died in vain
(Be they of friends or foes)
Rise and come back again
From peace that knows no end,
From faith that knows not doubt,
To haunt and sear and rend
The men that sent us out.

EQUES. (Egypt.)

The World of Books.

THE "NATION" OFFICE, THURSDAY NIGHT.

THE following is our weekly selection of books which we commend to the notice of our readers:—

- "The Reconstruction of South-Eastern Europe." By V. R. Savic. (Chapman & Hall. 7s. 6d. net.)
 "A League of Nations." By H. N. Brailsford. (Headley. 5s. net.)
 "Poland, Past and Present." By J. H. Harley. (Allen & Unwin. 4s. 6d. net.)
 "National Defence: A Study in Militarism." By J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P. (Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d. net.)
 "Across Asia Minor on Foot" By W. J. Childs. (Blackwood. 15s. net.)
 "Poems and Parodies." By T. M. Kettle. (Duckworth. 2s. 6d. net.)
 "Forced to Fight." By Erich Erichsen. (Heinemann. 2s. 6d. net.)
 "Vers la Démocratie Nouvelle." Par Lysis. (Paris: Payot. 3fr. 50.)

Books about books are often condemned (quite unjustifiably in my opinion), but few people would deny that there is a crying need for a book about books of travel. It will certainly be written some day, and if it is at all well done, it will be a boon to those who like to sit with their feet on the fender while they travel among unknown men, in lands beyond the sea. It will have to be a big book, for the literature of travel is enormous, and it must include such writers as Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Lady Hester Stanhope, Borrow and R. L. Stevenson, as well as the more businesslike travellers. It should not be too literary, though it must make some distinction between the literature of travel and mere records of journeys to distant or unexplored countries. At the same time, its author should have a sense of style, and avoid the faults of Jardine's "Travels," which, according to Southey, is "a book that conveys much thought in a most uninteresting manner." To protect us from books of this type will be one part of his task. To guide us to the best will be another, and to do this he must have read every book of travel, from Sir John Mandeville and Marco Polo onwards. "Enough," said Rasselas, 'thou hast convinced me that no human being can ever be a poet.' 'To be a poet,' said Imlac, 'is indeed very difficult.' To write a satisfactory book about books of travel is far from easy.

"The phrase 'literature of travel,'" says Mr. F. A. Kirkpatrick, who has contributed a chapter on the subject to the concluding volume of "The Cambridge History of English Literature," "suggests, in the first instance, such books as Sterne's 'Sentimental Journey,' Kinglake's 'Eothen,' Borrow's 'Bible in Spain,' Dufferin's 'Letters from High Latitudes,' Stevenson's 'Inland Voyage'—books in which the personality and literary power of the writer count for more than his theme." Oddly enough, the really great travellers have produced very little great literature, while the great men of letters have not been able to make much direct use of their travels. This is all the more difficult to explain when we remember the part that what professors call "the travel motive" has played in the world's literature. Almost all the great epics are stories of travel, and the same is true of most of the great books of fiction, from "The Golden Ass" to Mr. Conrad's latest romance. Yet how mediocre are Goethe's "Letters from Italy" and Fielding's "Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon" when compared with most of the other work of the same authors! And there is more of the stuff of literature in Xavier de Maistre's "Voyage autour de ma Chambre" than there is in the five folios of Captain Cook's "Voyages" round the world. It is the imaginary travels that have become classics, and the narratives of Robinson Crusoe and Lemuel Gulliver have every merit except truth.

TRUTH and accuracy are not quite the same thing, and I am strongly of Mr. Kirkpatrick's opinion that in a travel-book, viewed as literature, accuracy is no merit, unless the style and character of the book require it. Travellers' tales have a bad reputation, and it must be admitted that sometimes they have abandoned not merely accuracy, but even truth. Sir John Mandeville, for instance, puts a strain upon our credulity when he avers that the traveller, standing at the foot of Mount Ararat, can, "on a clear day," view the remains of Noah's ark resting on its summit. Even to-day

travellers have not wholly lived down this reputation. Louis de Rougemont proved that there are people who will believe most things. Dr. Cook's "My Attainment of the Pole" is not free from the attacks of scepticism, though its author concludes a long attack on Admiral Peary with the ingenuous statement: "I have been compelled to extreme measures of truth-telling that are abhorrent to me." Borrow, on the other hand, does not appear to have cared much about accuracy, but "The Bible in Spain," one of the finest travel-books ever written, bears, as Mr. Kirkpatrick says, the stamp of truth. Whether this or that page is the record of an actual occurrence is a matter of no consequence. "For Borrow, catching the very spirit of picaresque romance, gives a truer picture of Spain than any accurate description could offer."

WHICH is the best book of travel of the nineteenth century? Most people would plump for "Eothen," and in spite of the absence of all geographical, historical, or political facts, I would vote with the majority. Its impressionism, its easy style, and its rejection of any purpose except to entertain, make "Eothen" one of the most fascinating books of travel in the English language. Its only rival for first place among travel-books is Darwin's "Voyage of the Beagle," or, to give it its later title, "A Naturalist's Voyage Round the World." It is a classic, not only for its place in the history of science, but as a book of travel for the general reader. If these two are the best books of travel in English, there is a crowd of others that do not fall very much below them, and it is notable that so many of these are accounts of travel in the Near East. Warburton's "The Crescent and the Cross," published in the same year as "Eothen," ran through ten editions in nine years, and is still praised by critics, though it is a bit spoiled by attempts at fine writing. Ruskin pronounced Curzon's "Monasteries of the Levant" to be "the most delightful book of travels" he ever opened, while the writings of Palgrave and Layard have not altogether lost their popularity. Sir Richard Burton's "Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Mecca" is, in Mr. Stanley Lane Poole's words, "the strangest compound of Oriental learning, a grim sardonic humor, and an insobriety of opinion expressed in the writer's vigorous vernacular." Finally, among later books of travel, Mr. Charles Doughty's "Wanderings in Arabia" must be given very high rank. It is not, perhaps, everybody's book, for it has a flavor of its own; but those who care for it at all are enthusiastic in their admiration. Anybody who has not yet tried it can do so in Mr. Edward Garnett's edition, published in 1908 by Messrs. Duckworth.

AFRICA and the North and South Poles have been responsible for a goodly proportion of travel-books, though few of them rank with those I have mentioned on the Near East. Mungo Park's "Travels in the Interior of Africa" was much read in my early days, and I can recollect some of its descriptions with pleasure. But, of course, the standard books are those of Livingstone—admirable for its revelation of the noble character and powerful mind of the writer—Burton, Speke, Stanley, and Sir Samuel Baker. It was an African traveller and very accomplished writer, Mary Kingsley, who said that "nobody expected literature in a book of travel," and it must be confessed that we do not often get it. Kane's "Arctic Explorations" is one of the best books about the North Pole, though McClintock, Peary, and several others will always be read. Antarctic has to yield to Arctic so far as the world of books is concerned, but the last expedition will certainly add something to the literature of travel. Books on mountaineering are sometimes classed in the category of travel. Sir Leslie Stephen's "The Playground of Europe" is one of the few that can be read with pleasure by those who take no interest in climbing. Mr. Belloc's "The Path to Rome" is a book of travel. I mention this because I have heard of purchasers who acquired the book in the belief that they would find in it reasons either for or against a readjustment of their religious opinions. In this they showed that they had not the proper spirit of the traveller, which, as Stevenson said, is not to go anywhere, but to go: "I travel for travel's sake. The great affair is to move; to feel the needs and hitches of our life more nearly; to come down off this feather-bed of civilization and find the globe granite underfoot."

PENGUIN.

HAVE YOU INVESTED IN THE WAR LOAN?

The Last Day is Friday the 16th
and Germany is watching us.

If you have not already invested every shilling you can scrape together—do so now.

IF you have £5 or any amount up to £50 to lend go to the nearest Money Order Post Office and they will invest it for you in War Loan. You will get a receipt for your money and afterwards they will send you your stock.

HAS IT
OCCURRED TO YOU
that you can help
to end the War
by borrowing on
your Life Policies
OR
by obtaining a
Loan from your
Bank
OR

IF you have £50 or over to lend to your country go to your Bank Manager. He will help you to increase your lending power. The Bank Managers have intimated their desire to do everything in their power to make the Victory Loan an overwhelming success.

**BY CONVERTING YOUR TREASURY BILLS
INTO WAR LOAN.**

The Bank will accept the War Loan it buys for you as security for what it lends to you.

ISSUED BY ORDER OF HIS MAJESTY'S TREASURY.

Reviews.

LITERARY HISTORY.

"The Cambridge History of English Literature." Edited by Sir A. W. WARD and A. R. WALLER. Vols. XIII. and XIV. (Cambridge University Press. 9s. net per volume.)

[SECOND NOTICE.]

It is estimated in a footnote to the last chapter of the last volume of "The Cambridge History of English Literature" that, in 1600, there were about 6,000,000 persons who spoke English—a much smaller number than spoke French, or German, or Italian, or Spanish. To-day, on the other hand, English-speakers number about 120,000,000—"about double the aggregate of those who speak French, or Italian, or Spanish; and half as many again as speak German or Russian." Lest this amazing increase should seduce Englishmen into the mood of boastfulness, it is well to remember that the English-speaking world of 6,000,000 produced Shakespeare, while the English-speaking world of 120,000,000 regards it as something to be proud of to have produced Mr. Alfred Noyes. It is open to question whether literature gains when the use of a language becomes widespread. The Latin genius flourished most brightly before Latin became an all but universal tongue. It was the development of national languages out of the ruins of a universal one that gave France and Italy their literatures. It looks almost as though a writer, like an actor, can have too large an audience. In literature, a man does not address the world at large (which he knows shallowly), but the world at home (which he knows in the depths of his own and its own heart). He becomes universal, not through being conscious of a universal audience, but through his soul. He must write intimately in order to write well, and therefore he speaks, first of all, to his own people. Many poets have sung miraculously of England; no poet has ever written verse much above the level of a leading article about the British Empire or the English-speaking world. There is plenty of excellent rhetoric in verse about the great empires, but scarcely a line of it has any human or universal appeal. For great poets, it is hardly an exaggeration to say, the great empires simply do not exist.

Even the literature of the British Empire—to which several chapters are devoted in the fourteenth volume of "The Cambridge History of English Literature"—is rarely Imperial. The Canadian writes primarily for Canadians, the Australian for Australians, the Irishman for Irishmen. As regards Ireland, indeed, no great literature, apart from that which was written in Irish, grew up there until recent times, because there was no distinctively Irish audience in the country with whom English was the natural everyday speech. Mr. Alfred Perceval Graves, who contributes a chapter on Anglo-Irish literature to the "Cambridge History," unfortunately fails to do justice to his subject. His chapter contains many interesting facts and judgments, but a chapter on Anglo-Irish literature which makes no mention of James Clarence Mangan, can only be compared to a book on the Elizabethan theatre which would make no mention of Shakespeare. We do not suggest that Mangan was a poet of Shakespearean genius, but he is the most important figure in Anglo-Irish literature till the appearance of Mr. W. B. Yeats. Mangan, we think, might at least have been given the space devoted to telling us that "Bartholomew Simmons, who held an appointment in the London Excise Office till his death in 1850, was a popular contributor to leading English magazines," and that William McCullagh Torrens "had a distinct literary gift, of which his interesting and brightly-written 'Life of Melbourne' is a typical example." Authors like these, if they were worth recording at all, might well have been dealt with in the chapters on the lesser poets and the biographers. But Mangan is one of the grand sources of Anglo-Irish literature, and his omission detracts greatly from the value of the chapter. We should have liked also to see some reference made to the slender, but eloquent, volume of the writings of Fintan Lalor. Mr. Graves brings his survey to a close with a reference to Synge, who was, he declares, "descended, it is understood, from a Court musician dubbed 'Synge' for his vocal talents by Henry VIII."

Mr. Harold Child, writing on "The Literature of Australia and New Zealand," commits no sin of omission equal to Mr. Graves's in leaving out Mangan. But we cannot pass without a protest his dismissal of Francis Adams along with a list of other poets in a single sentence. Having named Adams and seven other poets, he says of the work of all of them:—

"It is the poetry of refined and cultivated minds; but it is free from wilful strangeness or from any native or imported taints of morbidity."

One wonders if Mr. Child has ever read "Songs of the Army of the Night," one of the few passionate expressions in literature of Anarchist hatreds and ideals. Imperfect in its artistry, it is none the less an extraordinarily fascinating document, sombre, seditious, and febrile. One is astonished to find an authority on the literature of the Australians neglecting work so individual as though it were mere pleasant, harmless stuff.

Professor Pelham Edgar is more successful in writing of "English-Canadian" literature, though he is, perhaps, inclined to overrate the work of Valency Crawford. His quotations from the work of Archibald Lampman, however, have the merit of interesting the English reader in a poet who is little known even now in this country. How admirably is the atmosphere of a hot day with a great hay-cart climbing slowly up a hill suggested in the following verse:—

"By his cart's side the wagoner
Is slouching slowly at his ease,
Half-hidden in the windless blur
Of white dust puffing to his knees.
This wagon on the height above,
From sky to sky on either hand,
Is the sole thing that seems to move
In all the heat-held land."

As for South African poetry, Sir T. Herbert Warren, who has a chapter on the subject, has not apparently been able to discover any deserving the name; otherwise he would scarcely have padded out his chapter with matter like this:—

"The influence of Tennyson, as was only natural, may be traced in much of the poetry of South Africa at this period. He had a great vogue there. A friend of the writer of this chapter, who knew South Africa well, and who lost his life in the South African War, told of an old Boer farmer who, when his last days came, wandered down to a stream on his farm, and was heard repeating the well-known verses of 'The Rivolet':

"No more by thee my steps shall be,
For ever and for ever."

"When Cecil Rhodes himself lay dying he quoted, as many will remember, the words of 'In Memoriam':
'So little done; so much to do.'"

We submit—as the lawyers say—that, in a work in which space is so precious that many famous authors have to be squeezed into a few sentences, divagations of this kind, however interesting in themselves, are out of place.

Oscar Wilde, for instance, though he is a writer of European fame, has fewer lines devoted to him than are occupied by the above anecdotes about Tennyson. We think that Professor Hugh Walker, whose chapter on "Critical and Miscellaneous Prose" is concerned with a curious omnium-gatherum of authors who, seemingly, could not be fitted in anywhere else, should have realized that, however much Wilde has been over-estimated, his literary influence is a historic fact which should have been worth more than a passing comment from a historian of literature. Not every critic of literature will agree with Professor Walker when he writes of Wilde: "'The Ballad of Reading Gaol' and 'De Profundis' are the product of his tragic overthrow, and are well worth all that he had previously written." As a matter of fact, Wilde wrote only one perfect thing—his farce, "The Importance of Being Earnest." His genius was a genius for iridescent wit, and it is here and in "Intentions" that we find it in its immortal delightfulness. "De Profundis," astonishing though it is, does not bear much re-reading. It is too theatrical, too showy, and one comes to doubt more and more its sincerity as a book of confessions. Both "De Profundis" and "The Ballad of Reading Gaol" owe much of their appeal to the fact that they were written by an ex-convict. "The Importance of Being Earnest" and "Intentions" would be miracles even though we knew less about the author than we do about Shakespeare. Yet Professor Walker actually gives less space to Wilde than to the author of "Rab and his Friends," and to John Skelton, who wrote "The Table Talk of Shirley." He devotes more space to Andrew Lang, to

Smith, Elder's New Books

FRIENDS OF FRANCE

The Authorised Account of the Field Service of the American Ambulance, written by its Members. The story of the finest thing America has done in the War. With many Illustrations. Large Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

FROM the St. LAWRENCE TO THE YSER

With the First Canadian Brigade

By Capt. F. C. CURRY. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d. net.

"It is sure to appeal to a large circle of readers. . . . The whole book is written with invincible good humour. Most interesting reading."—*Land and Water*.

FATHER PAYNE

By ARTHUR C. BENSON. Large post 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

"Restful and admirable. Father Payne is exactly the gentle, shrewd, and idealistic philosopher whom (knowing his parentage) one would expect."—*Punch*.

PATRIOTISM and FELLOWSHIP

By Dr. PERCY DEAMER. Crown 8vo. 2s. net. [Just ready]

LORD EDWARD

A Study in Romance. By KATHARINE TYNAN. With a Portrait of Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Large post 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

"No Englishman can read the book without coming to understand Ireland's ineradicably rooted mistrust of England. . . . Most interesting and delightful reading."—*Truth*.

TRAVELS IN LONDON

By the late CHARLES MORLEY. With Recollections by Sir EDWARD COOK, J. A. SPENDER, and J. P. COLLINS. With a Portrait. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

"To one who loves London Mr. Morley's writing is like the talk of a friend, and regret deepens that these are the last papers from his pen."—*Observer*.

THEODORE WATTS-DUNTON'S NEW NOVEL

VESPRIE TOWERS

By the Author of "Aylwin," &c. 6s. net. Second Impression

SEEN AND HEARD

Before and After 1914. By MARY and JANE FINDLATER, Authors of "Crossriggs," &c. Second Impression. 5s. net.

"Though the stories vary in interest, there is in all a touch of that inward sight which makes the simplest of them vital."—*The Times*.

THEY WHO QUESTION

By S. MACNAUGHTAN, Author of "The Fortune of Christina McNab," &c. Revised and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

"A book of much beauty and tenderness and deep religious feeling."—*Observer*.

London: SMITH, ELDER & CO., 15, Waterloo Place, S.W.

THE PUBLIC SPEAKER'S LIBRARY comprises HOW TO SPEAK EFFECTIVELY, 3rd Edition; SPEAKING IN PUBLIC (Fluency, &c.), 2nd Edition; and ELOCUTION IN THE PULPIT (4s. net each, postage 5d.). Also OUTLINES OF SPEECHES for Social Occasions, &c. (21s. net, postage 6d.). All by CHARLES SEYMOUR, (Simpkin, Marshall & Co.). All Booksellers.—For Syllabus of Chapters or prospectus of PRIVATE TUITION address Mr. C. SEYMOUR, 446, Strand, London.

To be powerful—strong of will, and to have all the attributes of virile strength—you need

VISEM

(Seed of Strength)

It is a concentrated Protein and Phosphorus food, combined with Lecithin and Glycerophosphate of Soda.

Your doctor will tell you that Lecithin is the finest Nerve food known to science, and that it is an absolute necessity for strong nerves. The organic Phospho-Protein, which exists in Vism to the extent of over 80%, is entirely absorbed into the system, and can be digested by the weakest. One pound of Vism in nutritive power is equivalent to six pounds of lean meat. When there is that "run down and tired feeling" Vism "picks you up," and speedily removes all nerve depression. The entire system is re-vitalised, and the nerves being once again healthy, are not felt.

Vism is prepared in tablets and powder form. The tablets, chocolate coated or plain, are sold in tins (containing 24) for 1/6, and have been found a boon to our fighting men in the trenches. The powder is 1/6, 2/6, 4/-, 7/6 a tin. Send post card for free sample and descriptive booklet to—

St. IVEL, Ltd., Dept. C (London Depot), Battersea Park, S.W.

"A VOLUME OF EXTRAORDINARY INTEREST."

THE SOUL OF FRANCE

BY

Dr. REUBEN SAILLENS

With Portrait of Author.

Cloth Boards, 5s. (post free 5/5).

The Rev. Dr. JOHN CLIFFORD says:—

"Thank you for '*The Soul of France*.' I have read it with keen interest. It is an admirable setting of the story of the spiritual life of the French people; of their struggles and defeats, of the intolerance of Church and State, and of the heroic fortitude and unflinching fidelity of the faithful. It helps us to see the France of yesterday and to-day. Few Britishers know France. Our antagonisms are over, but our ignorance remains. It is a great service M. Saillens has rendered to the *Entente* on the one hand and to the Gospel of the Kingdom on the other. The evangelist is rarely out of sight, and the throb of patriotism is on every page."

"To those privileged to enjoy a personal acquaintance with Pasteur Saillens and the pleasures of spiritual intercourse with him, he is known as a man of great charm of character, with the delightful courtesy for which his countrymen are famous, and a choice Christian mind. Indeed he has 'soul' very real and true, and impresses those he meets not only by his genuineness of life and graciousness of manner, but by his depth of fine feeling and greatness of heart. As the leader of Evangelicalism in France he is well fitted to write on the spiritual history and condition of his native land. . . .

"Dr. Saillens speaks of his work as 'a cursory view of the spiritual history of France.' In a sense it must be that, because of the vastness of the subject; but it is a most vivid survey, thrilling and fascinating, and written in that delightful English of which the author is so perfect a master."—*Christian Endeavour Times*.

"It is at once devout and learned, and will no doubt be read with interest and sympathy by many pious Protestant readers on this side of the Channel."—*The Scotsman*.

"A splendid optimism runs through every page of the book. Dr. Saillens views the future with confidence, believing with the poet, that 'the best is yet to be.' He has done a rare piece of service to his country by producing such an inspiring work—one, we believe, which will do much to remove many misconceptions concerning France, and one, too, that should go a long way towards strengthening the bonds between the two countries."—*Life of Faith*.

MORGAN AND SCOTT LTD.,

12, Paternoster Buildings, London, E.C.

Laurence Oliphant, to Anna Brownell Jameson. He devotes more space to Theodore Watts-Dunton! Professor Walker, we realize, had a very difficult task. To preserve one's sense of proportion in a chapter on Ruskin, Borrow, Pater, Hugh Miller, Richard Holt Hutton, Wilde, Sir Arthur Helps, Bagehot, Stevenson, "A. K. H. B.," and Richard Jefferies (to name only some of the authors dealt with) in such a way as to assign to each author the exact amount of room he deserves, is a task which would demand the skill of a magician.

Sir A. W. Ward has shown the necessary skill in his chapter on "Historians, Biographers, and Political Orators"—a masterpiece of summarizing and sound judgment. But Sir A. W. Ward and Mr. Saintsbury are exceptional in the genius for generalship they display among regiments of unruly authors.

There is no chapter in the closing volume more interesting than that by Mr. J. S. A. Phillips, of "The Yorkshire Post," on "The Growth of Journalism." Mr. Phillips takes us back in his survey to the eighteenth century, in the course of which "Dr. Johnson characterized English common folk as more educated, politically, than the people of other countries, and this because of the popularity of newspapers." He is of the opinion, it seems, that newspapers have degenerated, in a literary point of view, since those days. At least, he holds that at the end of the nineteenth century they appealed to "a lower average of literary appreciation than at the beginning." For our part, we fancy that if Lamb and Coleridge and Hazlitt were alive to-day, they would find as many openings for their work in journalism as they did a hundred years ago. At the same time, the fight for the "largest circulation" does induce many newspaper proprietors—mistakenly, in our opinion—to ignore more and more the finer qualities of thought and style which may be considered to be above the heads of the multitude. The magazines, however, have done far more to betray the honor of literature than have the newspapers. There are magazine-editors in London to-day who deliberately ask that stories shall not be "too well written." As for the daily press, it has improved in the graces of courtesy, if not of literature. "The Times," as Mr. Phillips says, would never in these days descend to the level of its reference to Macaulay as "Mr. Babble-tongue Macaulay" in the 'forties, when it said of him that "he was hardly fit to fill up one of the vacancies that had occurred by the lamentable death of Her Majesty's two favorite monkeys." Mr. Phillips comments on the improvement not only in the manners but in the morals of journalists. The Bohemianism and alcoholism of former days, he truly says, would no longer be tolerated:—

"It is impossible to imagine the occurrence at the end of the century, of an incident like that detailed in James Grant's 'Newspaper Press,' when the one reporter left on duty by his colleagues in the House of Commons, fabricated, for the benefit of an Irish colleague, a speech by Wilberforce, eulogizing the virtues of the potato, with the result that the speech appeared in all the London newspapers except 'The Morning Chronicle,' on which the practical joker himself was employed."

Mr. Phillips quotes many incidents of interest in his brief history of the "Times." He recalls that:

"Coleridge made advances to the second John Walter, proposing the impossible—that he should be appointed editor, with a perfectly free hand as to policy."

In speaking of Delane, Mr. Phillips refers to his great caution with regard to the publication of unauthenticated news:—

"When, in 1875, Blowitz, of world-fame in his day, and Paris correspondent of 'The Times,' sent word that Bismarck contemplated a fresh war with France, to prevent the latter from recovering her military strength, Delane held back the news for a fortnight—risking the grave possibility of being forestalled—while Chenery went to Paris, and obtained evidence fully confirming the report."

In our opinion, Mr. Phillips under-estimates the amount of intercourse that still takes place between statesmen and journalists. One would infer from some of his remarks that statesmen no longer communicate at political crises with the editors of newspapers.

Before saying farewell to this most useful history of English literature, we would suggest that in future editions the bibliographies should be revised and extended. Sometimes, when only a selection of an author's work is given, one of his most significant works—or even more than one—is omitted.

THE HISTORY OF THE SOUL.

"The Soul and its Story." By NORMAN PEARSON. (Arnold 10s. 6d. net.)

LIKE the works of Bergson and Driesch, Mr. Pearson's study in the philosophy of biology is easy reading and difficult thinking. It is easy, because the author sets forth modern scientific theories in a way intelligible and interesting to the general reader, and because he yokes them with startling philosophic theories of his own in a way highly stimulating to the imagination. It is difficult, because of the variety of the evidence, the richness of suggestion, a certain discontinuity in the argument, and the frequent transitions between scientific probability and metaphysical possibility.

Mr. Pearson's thesis, so far as one can disengage it from a multitude of incidental hypotheses, is this: Mind and matter have a common origin, Spirit. The manner of their formation was similar, but their futures are divergent. As matter may have been formed by an electrical current through ether, so "mind-stuff," a substance extended but imponderable, may have been formed by the rush of some "analogue of electricity" through "one of the finer ethers." With the material atom, on Mr. Pearson's hypothesis, is associated a mind-atom, and more complex mind-structures are built up as chemical structures are built. The simpler mind-structures probably undergo the same dissociation as their material companions, but at a certain moment in organic evolution mind-structure becomes stable enough to survive the dissolution of the body, and presses on toward the fulfilment of its own destiny. During the union of mind and matter in the organism, mind has been able (at least to a certain extent) to rule and mould matter to its own purposes; not by altering the quantity of its energy, but by occasionally altering its direction. What, then, becomes of the mind-structure upon the death of the body? It migrates, either into another body of the same species, or into a slightly higher species. As mind, at least upon the terrestrial plane, can only operate through a material body, and a material body suited to its stage of development, so the disembodied mind will be drawn, perhaps through some identity of vibration, to the brain in which it can realize itself. Mind evolves through experience, and by affecting its body it affects the bodies of the next generation; so that, in the long run, the developing minds will find themselves installed at rebirth in bodies allowing greater and greater scope for mental development. But in no body will the Soul (this migrating mind-structure) find opportunity for complete expression; what it can express of itself in any one incarnation will be a Self. The Soul has a history of many Selves. Mr. Pearson holds out hopes of development through indefinite time, until the Soul attains unity and completion of all the imperfect Selves in which in its history it has struggled for realization. In this completion (not on the terrestrial plane, certainly) the Soul and the Self will be identical.

In exposing this theory the author is led into a number of controversial scientific questions. The first is the origin of matter; the second is the origin of life; and the problem of soul-migration into higher species draws him into a theory of the descent of man. The author advances hypotheses in explanation of telepathy and animism. As his theory obliges him to accept the transmission of acquired variations, three chapters are occupied by a refutation of Weismannism. The reproduction cells in the adult body, Mr. Pearson thinks, are capable of at least occasionally being affected by changes in the body and brain, so that acquired variations will be inborn to the next generation. He then goes on to show that cases of dissociated personality do not disprove the unity of the soul, but prove merely that the same soul can sometimes be realized by different though related selves in the same body. And another chapter brings forward evidence for the probability that sexual distinctions survive the body.

Obviously, the argument of the book is not the support of a single hypothesis, but the support of an elaborate metaphysical theory which at every point requires some particular scientific hypothesis in defence of which evidence is adduced. The argument, therefore, bristles with difficulties of very different types. Even if each of the scientific hypotheses is made sufficiently plausible, the philosophical conclusion does not issue from these, but remains separate and distinct. It is simply another-hypothesis which is

THE WAR VICTIMS RELIEF COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

has been giving much help to the Suffering Victims of the War in several of the countries that have been devastated by it. It began its work very soon after the commencement of the war in 1914, and has continued it ever since, over an ever-expanding area.

It has raised ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHT THOUSAND POUNDS, most of which has been expended in helping the helpless and in carrying aid in a variety of ways where they have found it the most needed.

They have carried Medical Relief to all their centres of work, to the Maternity Hospital which they established at Chalons-sur-Marne, and they have given general medical and nursing relief throughout all the districts of the War Zone in France. Therein also they have constructed a large number of wood huts for the temporary shelter of those who have been made homeless by the destruction of their houses in the war, the timber for which has been furnished by the French Government, who have thus recognised the value of the service being rendered to many of their subjects, and for which the Local Authorities have expressed their gratitude in cordial terms.

Their work has extended to Serbia, Salonika, Corfu, Corsica, and Algiers for the Serbians, and to the Belgian Refugees in Holland, where they have been sedulously cared for by many of our workers.

More recently they have sent out to Buzuluk, in the Government of Samara, in Russia, a Hospital and Nursing Staff, where the need of the War Refugees appears to exceed anything that has been met with in other parts of Europe, where the number of the sufferers is almost without limit. Here are Refugees from Poland, from the War Zones of Russia, from Galicia, and elsewhere.

The demand for money and necessary relief material exceeds our preconceived ideas.

Most of the money which the Committee has raised and expended has come from the members of its own Society, therefore it feels justified, in view of the vastness of the need in

APPEALING to the GENERAL PUBLIC

for added help. It believes that as the work of the Committee becomes more widely known its labours will be approved, and this Appeal will not be made in vain.

It has now some 170 Helpers of both sexes actively engaged in its work, the most of whom are unpaid, and who have applied themselves heartily to this work of relief with the desire to give themselves with entire devotion to this work of relief to suffering humanity without regard to Nationality or Religious Profession.

Further particulars may be obtained from the Honorary Secretary,

MISS A. RUTH FRY

at the offices of the Committee at Ethelburga House, 91, Bishopsgate, London, to whom all communications should be addressed.

Macmillan's New Books

SIR RABINDRANATH TAGORE'S NEW POEMS

Stray Birds: Poems.

By Sir RABINDRANATH TAGORE, Author of "Gitanjali." With Frontispiece in Colour by Willy Pogany. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

Livelihood. DRAMATIC REVERIES. By WILFRID WILSON GIBSON, Author of "Friends," "Battle," "Borderlands," "Daily Bread," &c. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

The Times.—These intensely studied dramatic moments in the lives of men and women of many classes and pursuits show in some cases the best side of his keen sympathy and his gift for the literary representation of emotion.

A Defence of Classical

Education.

By R. W. LIVINGSTONE, Fellow and Assistant-Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d. net.

The Times.—"A statement, satisfactory in its fulness, excellent in its sanity and moderation, of the reasons for holding that, here and now, the study of the classics has a necessary and important place in such an education. . . . The whole book has a largeness and fairness which mark the scholar who is not a pedant, who is the master and not the slave of his own scholarship."

REV. WILLIAM TEMPLE'S NEW BOOK

Mens Creatrix: An Essay.

By WILLIAM TEMPLE, Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly; Hon. Chaplain to H.M. the King. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Thoughts on Religion at the Front.

By the Rev. NEVILLE S. TALBOT, Assistant-Chaplain-General, late Rifle Brigade, Author of "The Mind of the Disciples." Crown 8vo. 2s. net.

The Times.—"A sincere and candid little book."

Financial Chapters of the War.

By ALEXANDER DANA NOYES. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON.

THE ISSUE

By J. W. HEADLAM. (3rd Imp.) 2s. 6d. net

"An exceedingly able and judicious analysis of the fundamental issue over which Europe began to fight and is still fighting."

—*New Statesman*

CONSTABLE & Co. Ltd. 10 Orange St. LONDON W.C.

After riding, motoring, golf, or any other exercise, try a mustard bath. The potent oils in mustard make the bath more refreshing and stimulating and banish soreness and stiffness.



**Colman's
Mustard Bath**

"Let Mustard
prepare your bath."

S.H.B.

probably untrue *unless* these are true; but these may be true and the philosophical conclusion false. There are, however, more positive objections to raise.

Mr. Pearson starts with a vigorous attack upon Materialism. And here he introduces (page 17) a contention which from his own point of view he has no right to introduce, and which in his account is entirely out of place. "So far from Mind being a mere appanage of Matter, Matter itself is a creation of Mind." This inversion he uses to urge that matter is "merely a name which we give to some of our perceptions. . . . Mind, therefore, is necessarily prior to Matter." But this is essentially an idealistic argument, and Mr. Pearson's view turns out to be anything but idealistic. He wishes to convince us of the superiority of mind to matter. Yet if, as he tells us, the difference is merely the difference between electricity passing through ether, and "some analogue of electricity" passing through some "finer" ether, it is difficult to see why mind should dominate matter, or why it should be prior in appearance. And, in any case, matter on this hypothesis is not a "name given to some of our perceptions." Mr. Pearson takes refuge in ether. But though ether may not be "matter" in the ordinary sense, it is none the more spiritual, and an ethereal science may well be a philosophical materialism.

Nothing can prevent this extremely ingenious theory of "mind-substance" from appearing materialistic. No objection could be raised to this if Mr. Pearson's system were materialistic through and through. The view would be tenable, although the mind substance would, perhaps, be a superfluous reduplication of the material substance. It is difficult to see, for example, how it helps to explain the origin of life. Mr. Pearson does not believe that mere complexity of chemical structure could give rise to sentience. But we find that complexity of mind-structure is what does it. Even the atom, Mr. Pearson seems to hold (page 70), has an atomic mind, but not sentient. "Though the difference between the living and the non-living is indeed a difference of kind, yet it rests on what is only a difference of degree." Why should a difference of degree in this mind structure (which is quasi-material) provide a more plausible explanation than a difference of degree in ordinary chemical structure? And why should the Spirit which is the source of both matter and mind be described as a "Conscious Volitional Energy"? And why should it proceed (on page 297) to generate a Demiurge whom we worship as God?

The book might be described as a modern "Timæus." The logical structure is weak; there are side issues. On the other hand, the book is most absorbing reading: crammed with suggestive observations on biology, psychology, theology, and metaphysics; every chapter should provoke the reader to new trains of thought. And, as with Plato, we retain at the end a persuasion that the author's main contention may be right.

"Le Dante," on page 52, should presumably read "Le Dantec." The absence of an index is regrettable in so substantial a book; and also the absence, in the discussion of evolution, of names connected with such important theories as are those of De Vries, Semon, or Samuel Butler.

AN ESSAY IN ANTI-MILITARISM.

"National Defence: A Study in Militarism." By J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P. (Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d. net.)

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD is an adept at the art of rapid generalization. His best written work moves at a great pace, covers much ground, and leaves its main effects vividly exposed. The thesis of his little work on "National Defence," is a simple one, and lends itself to this treatment. Mr. MacDonald insists that the battle between democracy and militarism which we see involved in the struggle between Germany and ourselves is also a fight within each of the belligerent areas, and that, in the course of the conflict, all the peoples have surrendered great territories of mind and will to their enemy. Here Mr. MacDonald's line is that of out-and-out pacifism. So long as there are armies, there will be wars. No form of military service which modern warfare demands can be other than anti-democratic in its full

political result, and in its form of final efficiency must, he thinks, be destructive of all democracy. The only countering effect can come through an immediate passage to internationalism. As soon as the war is over, there must be corporate action on the part of the workers in all countries, linked with the Parliamentary parties. The forces thus set in motion must pursue a common policy, decided at joint conferences, and held together by a permanent organization.

Mr. MacDonald's examination of militarism carries with it the rejection or the modification of every competing or compromising plan for doing away with war. Thus, he will have nothing to do with Jaurès's famous idea of the army of defence—the citizen army. This he rejects on the double ground that in war there is no distinction between defence and offence, and that democratic armies are just as aggressive as any other. Nor does he believe in our own return to the expeditionary force and the voluntary army for India and foreign service. Military conscription involves industrial conscription, and the consequent surrender of civil and political liberties to the autocratic State, of which the conscript army is the weapon and the servant. Naturally, too, he regards the League of Nations as inadequate, unless it can be linked up with open diplomacy, so that the rule of the Foreign Offices can yield place to as complete a control by the people of exterior as of interior policy. We confess we have never thought of the League in any other light. Reactionaries of the type of the editor of the "Spectator" have, indeed, affected to treat it as a reversion to the Holy Alliance. But that is a wilful error of prejudice. It is not a new organ of the existing order which the world wants; it is a new order with its appropriate agents, and the one is impossible without the other. The League of Peace is, at the root of it, a method of appealing to public opinion. It must, therefore, have a Parliamentary, and not merely a diplomatic, basis, and, in its turn, the democracy in each country must have knowledge of what the League and its own Government are doing. Thus all the liberating processes—the reduction of armaments, the setting up of Committees on foreign affairs, the mapping out of the political work of the International Council and of the juridical work of the Commissions attached to it—can go on together. None of them are impossible unless the war ends on a note of vindictive and relentless hatred, leaving democracy and militarism, in Mr. MacDonald's phrase, "at hand-grips." Then indeed we may well fear that the idea of an international order will have been slain before it has had time to come to birth.

That is the real peril, and the most impressive part of Mr. MacDonald's book is his brilliantly emphatic treatment of it. There is a considerable school of opinion, even in Liberal and Labor circles, which holds that if we can force Germany to the same kind of political crisis as France underwent in 1870, and rid her of the Hohenzollerns as Moltke relieved France of the Napoleons, we shall be faced with a pacific German democracy. We agree with Mr. MacDonald that that is not evident. We may rest assured that a German democracy will remain intensely German. If it is also vehemently anti-English, its first impulse may be to "polish and sharpen" the German sword as effectively as did the House of Frederick the Great. All depends on whether in spite of the crimes of their rulers and our sense of the suffering they have brought on the world, we can finally come to terms with a people of "great energy, great mental power, great industrial enterprise, great organizing capacity, great patience," or whether we shall finish up our fight with them in a spirit of complete ill-will. Mr. MacDonald's judgment is that if this is the end of the war, militarism, the common enemy of Europe, will emerge as its common Master. He quotes with great effect Jaurès's foreboding vision (in 1905) of a German and British antagonism in which the two peoples, "striking at each other desperately," would "bruise and wound one another and splash the world with blood; but neither of them would eliminate the other, and after an exhausting struggle, they would still have to reckon with each other." We agree with Mr. MacDonald that that is a question for statesmanship. The armies cannot settle it. Civilian passion on both sides even tends to aggravate and protract their task. By an effort of will we must, as Mr. MacDonald says, become civilized over again, and it does not seem too early to begin.

THE LONDON CITY & MIDLAND BANK

LIMITED.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

Subscribed Capital - - - £22,947,804 0 0 | Paid-up Capital - - - - £4,780,792 10 0
Reserve Fund - - - - £4,000,000 0 0

DIRECTORS:

SIR EDWARD H. HOLDEN, Bart., Chairman and Managing Director.
WILLIAM GRAHAM BRADSHAW, Esq., London, Deputy-Chairman.

THE RIGHT HON. LORD AIREDALE, Leeds.
SIR PERCY ELLY BATES, Bart., Liverpool.
ROBERT CLOVER BEAZLEY, Esq., Liverpool.
THE RT. HON. LORD CARNOCK, G.C.B., London.
DAVID DAVIES, Esq., M.P., Llandinam.
FRANK DUDLEY DOCKER, Esq., C.B., Birmingham.

FREDERICK HYNDE FOX, Esq., Liverpool.
H. SIMPSON GEE, Esq., Leicester.
JOHN GLASBROOK, Esq., Swansea.
ARTHUR T. KEEN, Esq., Birmingham.
FREDERICK WILLIAM NASH, Esq., Birmingham.

THE RIGHT HON. LORD PIRRIE, K.P., London.
THOMAS ROYDEN, Esq., Liverpool.
SIR JOSEPH WESTON-STEVENS, Bristol.
THE RIGHT HON. SIR GUY FLEETWOOD WILSON, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., G.C.I.E., London.
WILLIAM FITZTHOMAS WYLEY, Esq., Coventry.

HEAD OFFICE: 5, THREADNEEDLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Joint General Managers: J. M. MADDERS, S. D. MURRAY, F. HYDE, E. W. WOOLLEY. Secretary: E. J. MORRIS.

Dr.	LIABILITIES AND ASSETS, 31st December, 1916.		Cr.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
To Capital Paid up, viz.:—				
£2 10s. 0d. per Share on				
1,912,317 Shares of £12 each	4,780,792	10 0		
„ Reserve Fund	4,000,000	0 0		
„ Dividend payable on 1st Feb-				
ruary, 1917	322,703	9 11		
„ Balance of Profit and Loss				
Account, as below	243,538	5 10		
	9,347,034	5 9		
„ Current, Deposit and other				
Accounts	174,620,724	17 0		
„ Acceptances on account of				
Customers	7,220,780	12 2		

Dr.	PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT for the year ending 31st December, 1916.		Cr.
	£	s. d.	£ s. d.
To Interim Dividend at the rate of 18 per cent. per annum for the half-year ending 30th June, 1916, less Income Tax ...	344,217	1 3	
„ Dividend payable on 1st Feb- ruary, 1917, at the rate of 18 per cent. per annum, less Income Tax	322,703	9 11	
„ Investment Account	632,501	0 6	
„ Payment of Salaries to Members of the Staff serving with His Majesty's Forces and Bonus to others	207,606	13 2	
„ Balance carried forward to next account	243,538	5 10	
	£1,750,566	10 8	
			By Balance from last Account 113,597 15 2
			„ Net profits for the year ending 31st Decem- ber, 1916, after providing for all Bad and Doubtful Debts 1,636,968 15 6
			£1,750,566 10 8

EDWARD H. HOLDEN, CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR.
W. G. BRADSHAW, DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN.

H. SIMPSON GEE, } DIRECTORS.
PERCY E. BATES, }

REPORT OF THE AUDITORS TO THE SHAREHOLDERS OF THE LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK LIMITED.
In accordance with the provisions of Sub-section 2 of Section 113 of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1906, we report as follows:-
We have examined the above Balance Sheet in detail with the Books at Head Office and with the certified Returns from the Branches.
We have satisfied ourselves as to the correctness of the Cash Balances and the Bills of Exchange and have verified the correctness of the Money at Call and Short Notice. We have also verified the Securities representing the Investments of the Bank, and having obtained all the information and explanations we have required, we are of opinion that such Balance Sheet is properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the Company's affairs according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us and as shown by the books of the Company.

WHINNEY, SMITH & WHINNEY, CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS,
Auditors.

LONDON, 11th January, 1917.

SINCERITY.

"The Religious Poems of Lionel Johnson: A Selection from his Collected Works." (Elkin Mathews. 2s. 6d. net.)

WHETHER the war has to do with it or not, or whether the faint renewal of interest in the seventeenth century is a more potent reason, there promises to be a revival in religious poetry. How this revival will shape itself, to what extent it is strong enough to shake itself free from a possibly accidental impetus and hoist its own sails, whether it will gather its imagery from, or declare its allegiance to, some particular creed or theology—these are speculations in the air. But if the example of Mr. Ralph Hodgson (if only he were a little more productive), to our mind, a more than potentially great poet, is to bear fruit, then this poetry of the future is more likely to be secular, metaphysical, and universal than the foster-child of doctrine or of the crude professed mysticism common in the years immediately before the European tragedy. Now, Lionel Johnson belonged to the Catholic group of some years previously (he died in 1902), the group which included Francis Thompson, Mrs. Meynell, and Patmore. No comparison between him and the contemporary young poets is possible, partly because his inspiration is not actual enough to exert any but a casual influence, partly because his imagery, modes of speech, and poetic furniture are exclusively Catholic, and partly because he was a better prose-writer than he was a poet. His study of Thomas Hardy and his critical essays were a definite achievement in aesthetics; his poetry possesses many attractive and impressive qualities, but poetry in the fine, rare, full sense of the word, it very seldom is.

A selection of his religious poems is, perhaps, more unfair to him than it ought to be. It is too exacting a test. In the complete works of a poet, the reader is quite content to seek and only find occasional beauties; but in a volume of selected pieces, as in an anthology, one is in the expectation of a ripe harvest, liable to stress and underline the indifferent, the dull, and the failures:—

"O, Mary and Joseph! hath not she,
Ireland, been even as ye?"

or:—

"Dark Angel, with thine aching lust
To rid the world of penitence;
Malicious Angel, who still dost
My soul such subtle violence."

or:—

"Now from the still throne of Thy tabernacle,
Wilt come to me in glory, O Lord God!
Thou wilt, I doubt Thee not; I worship Thee
Before Thine holy altar, the long night."

If these lamenesses and harshnesses rise up and strike a reader who has not room enough or riches enough in and by which to forget them, how much more does not the poet suffer when one has to make a very meagre selection of real poetic fulfilment out of a selection?

Lionel Johnson's Catholic faith, indeed, and his devoted familiarity with it, do more to hinder than to aid his poetic impulse. With Francis Thompson, it was exactly the other way about. This copiously imaginative, fiery, and adventurous genius discovered in his religion just the wealth of imagery, color, and symbol that he wanted to give it a splendor and amplitude of poetic diction. But Lionel Johnson's still, honest, gentler sensibility was cumbered by the very argosy which enriched his greater brother-poet. There is really only one poem in the book, though many others have dignity, grace, pathos, keen aspiration, and delicacy; and only two stanzas out of the four in the poem, which arrive at a complete poetic maturity and do in a tender music express the complete interior thought of the poet. But, in theme, it might just as well have been a poem to his mistress, as one called "Pax Christi":—

"Eyes have their fill of light; in every voice
Lives its own music; but the dead light pales,
The golden music perishes. What choice—
What choice is ours, but tears? For the world fails."

"O, Sun and Stars! O glory of the rose!
O, eyes of light, voices of music! I
Have mourned because all beauty fails, and goes
Quickly away; and the whole world must die."

But, as a rule, it is Johnson's expression rather than his

thought which is esoteric. That thought always emerges better sustained, firmer, and more precise when it is contained in the natural religious feeling of the poet rather than in a specifically religious phrasing:—

"Behold us here!
In prison bound, but with your chains;
Sufferers, but of alien pains.
Merry the world, and thrives apace,
Each in his customary place;
Sailors upon the carrying sea,
Shepherds upon the pasture,
And merchants of the town; and they
Who march to death, the fighting way;
And there are lovers in the spring,
With those who dance and those who sing;
The commonwealth of every day,
Eastward and westward, far away."

There is a fresh simplicity here, full of freedom and movement. How much superior to the wretched poem, so often quoted, "Sursum Corda":—

"Lift up your hearts! We lift
Them up
To God and to God's gift,
The Passion Cup."

Johnson's temper was invitational and not devotional. In his purely religious poems, with their specialized expression, his metaphors are seldom apt, or his similes illuminating. His "Seraphic and Uranian quires" are too often but extrinsic decoration.

But the pervading effect of these poems (interrupted by a few stirring Latin ones, and vilely bound, by the way, with a yellow ochre back) is their sincerity. Though Johnson was apt to get lost among rich or rarefied imagery, he never loses sight of his sincerity. That supports him in his clumsiest endeavors, gives a tranquillity to his poems of resignation, and a clear, penetrating and dignified voice to his very few poems of complete felicity.

A JUMBLE SALE.

"Nothing Matters." By HERBERT BEERBOHM TREE. (Cassell. 6s.)

"The Silver Chain." By WILLIAM BLAKE RICHMOND. (Palmer & Hayward. 6s. net.)

"The Eyes of the Blind." By M. P. WILLCOCKS. (Hutchinson. 6s.)

"The Bigamist." By F. E. MILLS YOUNG. (Lane. 6s.)

"Grace Lorraine." By DOUGLAS SLADEN. (Hutchinson. 6s.)

"Pelle the Conqueror: No. IV. Daybreak." By ANDERSON NEXÖ. Translated by JESSIE MUIR. (Sidgwick & Jackson. 6s.)

SIR HERBERT TREE'S book is a miscellany of sketches, love stories, satires, with a presidential address about humor ("Humor is the onion of the human salad") in tragedy incongruously thrown in, so that Sir Herbert may keep his readers in mind of his versatility. This is a passage from "The Madonna of the Yellow Rose":—

"Suddenly, as if by magic, he beheld a rhapsody of red and gold—it was the face of a woman. For a moment he was uplifted into fairyland as by the wand of some magician; the butterfly seemed transformed into a goddess. Guy stared. No—it was a reality. There, peering through the leaves above the waterfall, was the face of a girl. . . . On her lips was a smile, half of thankfulness, half of amusement; in her eyes were tears of gratitude; on her cheeks was the blush of discovery. Two arrows darted from her eyes and flashed into his heart. He felt that a supreme moment of his life was striking—an impression which was destined never to fade."

Elsewhere, Sir Herbert tells us (with proud humility) that the reason why he never reads books is because "I am afraid of cramping my style." It is, no doubt, this noble freedom from pedantry, this lofty disdain of learning tritely from others, that enables Sir Herbert to write sentences of such striking originality as: "He felt that a supreme moment of his life was striking—an impression which was destined never to fade," and to gather the unique experience of beholding a rhapsody.

Sir William Richmond's novel is so well paved with good intentions that we find it heavy reading. Sir William has a double theme—the romance of the beautiful model

Huts wanted for the Front Trenches

THE CHURCH ARMY

is requested to provide

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY MORE RECREATION HUTS

(PORTABLE)

AND CLUBS UNDER SHELL-FIRE ON THE SOMME FRONT ALONE

in addition to the Hundreds already on the west Front and at Home
and in other theatres of the war

CHURCHMEN (INELIGIBLE) TO MAN THEM ARE AN ABSOLUTE NECESSITY

PRAY HELP US TO SUPPLY BOTH HUTS AND MEN

**Each Hut costs £300, and its Equipment £100 (Week's
Working £5 abroad, £2 at home)**

KITCHEN CARS on Western Front.
NAVAL HOSPITAL IN SCOTLAND. Named bed £50.
MUNITIONS CANTEENS for ordnance workers.
HOSTELS for Men on leave.
BRITISH PRISONERS in GERMANY 6s. parcels.
TREATS FOR TROOPS. 6s. parcels for men at Front.
RECREATION ROOMS for SOLDIERS' WIVES.

REST HUTS for girls on munition work.
HOSTELS for girl workers and soldiers' wives.
WIVES and WIDOWS in Fresh Air Homes.
FRIENDS for WOUNDED in distant Hospitals.
RELATIVES of WOUNDED escorted abroad.
DISTRESS during and after War.

Cheques crossed "Barclay's a/c Church Army" payable to Prebendary Carlile, D.D., Hon. Chief Secretary,
Headquarters, Bryanston Street, Marble Arch, London, W.



"PERFECTOS Nº 2"

VIRGINIA CIGARETTES

(HAND MADE)

High-Class Cigarettes of superb
delicacy, the result of a matchless
blend of the finest Virginia Tobacco.

10 for 7½d. 20 for 1/3
50 for 3/- 100 for 5/6

"PERFECTOS FINOS" are larger
Cigarettes of the same quality.

For distribution to Wounded British Soldiers and
Sailors in Military Hospitals at Home and for the Front
at Duty Free Prices. Terms on application to

JOHN PLAYER & SONS, NOTTINGHAM

SOLE Branch of The Imperial Tobacco Co. (of Great Britain & Ireland), Ltd.

Prudential Assurance Company, Ltd.

HOLBORN BARS, LONDON.

Invested Funds - - - - £94,000,000
Claims Paid - - - - £126,000,000

**BIBLES AND
PRAYER BOOKS**
For PRIZES, &c.

The London Bible Warehouse
22, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Have the Largest and best Selection in London.
We specialise in Bibles, Prayer Books, Church
Services, etc., for Clergy, Congregation, and the
Children.

Please write, phone, or call. List sent post free.
TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 339.

TRIUMPH



The thing needed by all
Despatch Riders—DEPEND-
ABILITY. This is embodied
in the Trusty Triumph

TRIUMPH CYCLE Co., Ltd., COVENTRY

Annunziata and her young painter, and the fortune-hunting Esprits's sale of their daughter Mary to the South African speculator, Mr. Flintstone. Sir William feels a generous indignation against commercial ethics and the meanness and moral shabbiness of the respectabilists. But he might, with advantage, have adopted a less voluminous and more adroit method of expressing it. "The Silver Chain," honest and kindly as it is, is a warning that distinction in one province of art does not imply expertness in another.

"The Eyes of the Blind" affords Miss Willcocks a rare opportunity for presenting us with one of those chesty (as Jack London would have called it) elementals dear to the melting heart of Mr. W. J. Locke. Now, Jack London gave them a certain stormy vitality, because he was one of them himself. But these other Originals, with their eternal and pretentious tub-thumping, are even more tedious than the Noble Savage of eighteenth-century coffee-houses. In Miss Willcocks's Cornish novel, Dr. Rudd is our Fee-Fi-Fo-Fummer. Everything that is not "free and flowing, the offspring of the simple rudiments of feelings," and, we may add, of intelligence, common sense, and consideration for others, sets him roaring like the ass in the lion's skin. Wonderful is the love of women! we exclaim, when his poor wife, Dorothy Rosewarne, persists in admiring him. But if the author's hero is a Free and Hearty, that is more than her style is. "The artist was the best part of him," for instance, she expresses by: "The artist-soul in himself was incomparably the noblest part of his make-up." It is a pity that Miss Willcocks should waste her time over Dr. Rudd, because, if an average (a good average) novelist, she is sincere and capable.

Pamela is married to an offensive boor, called Arnott. He has another wife alive, but when she discovers his duplicity, by accident, she decides still to live with him. There is something rather refreshing in the motive which Miss Young assigns to Pamela's choice. She will live with him as his mistress, not for any high-falutin' reasons of self-sacrifice, but simply because she is in love with him. But when Arnott disguises his first wife's death from her, when he takes no steps towards marrying her, and begins to treat her as a mistress in fact as well as in name, she is more than inclined to listen to the chivalrous advances of George Dare. George is perpetually on the high-horse, and we have more than enough of him. He is the sort of man who would never dream of putting his hands in his pockets. Finally, Arnott runs off with the governess of Pamela's children, is stricken with paralysis, and nursed by Pamela for the rest of an invalid life. George keeps up the waiting attitude remarkably well—it suits his elevated soul far more than a tame marriage with Pamela would have done. "The Bigamist," indeed, in spite of some absurdities, is a creditable piece of work. It is genuinely felt, and it is not vulgar.

Mr. Sladen's "Grace Lorraine" assaults our nostrils, as it were the steam of the Simmering Pot. It is all about heiresses and Zeppelins and second lieutenants and Boches and exquisite sensibilities, all basted together in the said pot by a language that never was heard even at the Ritz and the stately mansions of the great. It is a kind of sticky confection compounded of Fleet and Wardour Streets. But if "Grace Lorraine" has anything to do with the aforesaid pot, perhaps Mr. Sladen brewed it *cum grano salis*!

The worst of this fourth, and last, instalment of "Pelle the Conqueror" is that it is difficult for the reader to remember what went before it. Pelle has now been released from prison, and returned to his wife, Ellen, and their children. He finds the working-class movement, having forgotten its allegiance to its old ideals, occupied with Parliamentaryism. After a bitter struggle with poverty and boycott, he goes to live in the country, and there, with his friend the rich librarian, Brun, conceives an ambitious co-operative movement in the shoemaking industry. The rest of the book is occupied with his struggles, his happy domestic environment, and the partial realization of his new and unconquerable ideal. "Pelle the Conqueror" is not a great book, but it is full of rare feeling and enthusiasm for a noble cause. It is rather poorly constructed, and has many desert patches for the reader to tramp through. Its tonelessness of style one must, perhaps, attribute to a somewhat clumsy translation. It is a book of excellent, but hardly of the best, qualities.

The Week in the City.

THE New Loan still absorbs all money and attention. The Stock Exchange has begun to grumble at the results, which it must have foreseen. There is very little business, and most of it is caused by sales on behalf of those who wish to invest in the War Loan. Apparently it has again become difficult to deal, because jobbers do not care to make prices until they know whether stock is available, or whether they can find a buyer. The declines that have taken place are considered moderate. The smallness of the liquidation is doubtless due to the fact that bankers are lending so freely, and are encouraging their customers by this means to invest money which they do not possess in War Loan. This topic has been handled freely by all the leading bankers at the annual meetings held during the last fortnight. Sir Edward Holden has given out quite an essay on the war finances of Great Britain and Germany, and on the position of the United States. He has also come out as an advocate of the decimal and metric systems, with the idea of encouraging our foreign trade after the war. Mr. Birch Crisp expresses the feeling of the City in resenting the threat of a compulsory loan, without interest, which Mr. Hayes Fisher brandished at a War Loan meeting the other day. The unanimous adoption by the Labor Congress, at Manchester, of a tax on unearned incomes, graduated up to 15s. in the pound, is also giving rise to uneasy feelings as to what our financial condition will be after the war. Treasury Bills are falling due at a great rate, and, pending the receipts from the War Loan, the Treasury is forced to borrow heavily on deficiency bills. Consols have now fallen below 52, and the gilt-edged market is correspondingly depressed. Italian and Russian money has been falling in value.

WAR LOAN INSURANCE.

Wednesday was the last day on which the payment of 3s. 4d. per cent. interest was offered to applicants for fully-paid allotments in the War Loan, but other unofficial inducements are still being held out to those who are in doubt as to the amount they can lend to the Government. The Eagle and British Dominions Insurance Companies announce that they will advance the money up to the full amount required to purchase the Stock, and at the same time will issue a policy which will automatically pay off the advance in either five, ten, or fifteen years, at the subscriber's option. It is, in effect, an endowment insurance policy, with the benefit payable either at death or at maturity in War Loan Stock instead of cash. Another insurance company, the London and Lancashire Life and General, offers a "War Loan Policy," the object of which is to secure immediate repayment of outstanding loans for bankers in the event of the death of the borrower, any balance being paid to his estate.

A RAILWAY DIVIDEND SURPRISE.

None of the Home Railway dividends announced so far have shown any change, except that of the Hull and Barnsley, which came as a pleasant surprise. In declaring a final dividend of 2½ per cent., as against 1½ per cent., making the total distribution for the year 3 per cent., instead of 2 per cent., the directors add: "The net returns include an estimate of the amount to be paid by the Government for interest in respect of the capital expenditure on the company's undertakings brought into use since December 31st, 1912." This statement is of some importance, for it may be assumed that credit for the amount would not have been taken unless it was certain that it would be received from the Government, and there can hardly be much delay in making a settlement. Other companies which have increased their capital expenditure will, presumably, be similarly treated, and companies like the North-Western, the North-Eastern, the Great Western, and the South-Western should be entitled to large sums on this account. It is hardly to be expected, however, that there will be any general raising of dividends, at any rate until the money has actually been received. But the fact that a settlement has been arrived at, should give increased confidence to holders of Home Railway stocks.

LUCELLUM.

he
ch
nd
sh
ne
es
ey
re
is
y,
est
ic
he
rd
of
he
he
ng
es
al-
er
he
er,
he
ur
are
he
on
he
an

of
ly-
ial
abt
gle
nat
to
icy
ve,
ect,
ble
ead
and
y,"
of
of

far
and
g a
ing
of
an
for
om-
1st,
may
een
the
ing
neir
ted,
ern,
tled
ted,
nds,
ved.
ould
cks.